

Association of American Colleges Bulletin

VOLUME XXXVI

MARCH, 1950

NUMBER 1

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

ROBERT N. DUBOSE

Assistant Editor

BERTHA TUMA

ELIZABETH HORN

Editorial Assistants

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

March, May, October, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

LB
2301
.A84

*General
Direct*

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1950-51

President: Daniel L. Marsh, President, Boston University.

Vice President: LeRoy E. Kimball, Vice Chancellor, New York University.

Treasurer: John R. Cunningham, President, Davidson College.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavely.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

Board of Directors: (additional members) M. E. Sadler, President, Texas Christian University; G. Herbert Smith, President, Willamette University; Clark G. Kuebler, President, Ripon College; Celestin J. Steiner, President, University of Detroit.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: (1951)* President John W. Nason, Swarthmore College, *Chairman*; President Francis E. Corkery, Gonzaga University; President Weir C. Ketler, Grove City College; (1952) President Alan W. Brown, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; President Harwell G. Davis, Howard College; President Frederick D. Patterson, Tuskegee Institute; (1953) Dean Millicent C. McIntosh, Barnard College; President Joe J. Mickle, Centenary College; President D. M. Nelson, Mississippi College.

COMMISSION ON THE ARTS: (1951) Chancellor R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; President Fred D. Fagg, Jr., University of Southern California; President George K. Funston, Trinity College; President Theodore H. Jack, Randolph-Macon Woman's College; (1952) President Clarence R. Decker, University of Kansas City; President E. Wilson Lyon, Pomona College; Sister M. Helene, Siena Heights College; President J. L. Zwingle, Park College; (1953) President Harry L. Dillin, Linfield College; President Paul D. Eddy, Adelphi College; President Irwin J. Lubbers, Hope College; President Robert N. Montgomery, Muskingum College.

COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: (1951) President Hunter B. Blakely, Queens College, *Chairman*; Secretary Robert Gibson, United Presbyterian Board of Education; President Raymond F. McLain, Transylvania College; President Dale H. Moore, Cedar Crest College; President Robert J. Slavin, Providence College; (1952) President Conrad Bergendoff, Augustana College; Secretary Matthew S. Davage, Board of Education, Methodist Church; President James F. Findlay, Drury College; President John A. Flynn, St. John's University; President John L. Plyler, Furman University; (1953) President Katherine G. Blyley, Keuka College; President Howard F. Lowry, College of Wooster; President Clyde A. Milner, Guilford College; President Comerford O'Malley, DePaul University; President Edwin E. Voigt, Simpson College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND INDUSTRY: (1951) President Harold E. Stassen, University of Pennsylvania, *Chairman*; President Colgate W. Darden, Jr., University of Virginia; President William V. Houston, Rice Institute; (1952) President David A. Lockmiller, University of Chattanooga, *Vice Chairman*; President William L. Keleher, Boston College; President Frank Hugh Sparks, Wabash College; (1953) President Clarence P. Mc-

* Note: Term expires on date indicated.

Clelland, MacMurray College; President Morgan S. Odell, Lewis and Clark College; President Samuel S. Stratton, Middlebury College.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: (1951) Dean Mark H. Ingraham, University of Wisconsin, *Chairman*; President Everett N. Case, Colgate University; President Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; (1952) President R. McA. Lloyd, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association; Dean O. H. Rechard, University of Wyoming; President William E. Stevenson, Oberlin College; (1953) President Robert P. Daniel, Virginia State College; President James A. McCain, Montana State University; President Edward J. Sparling, Roosevelt College.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS: (1951) Director B. M. Cherrington, University of Denver, *Chairman*; Paul J. Braisted, The Hazen Foundation; President Virgil M. Hancher, State University of Iowa; President Rufus C. Harris, Tulane University; President Robert L. Stearns, University of Colorado; (1952) President Mary Ashby Cheek, Rockford College; President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College; President R. G. Gustavson, University of Nebraska; President Francis S. Hutchins, Berea College; President Charles J. Turck, Macalester College; (1953) Sister Catherine Dorothea, Trinity College, (Washington); President Arthur S. Adams, University of New Hampshire; President David L. Crawford, Doane College; President Calvert N. Ellis, Juniata College; President Wilbur W. White, University of Toledo.

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION: (1951) President Gordon K. Chalmers, Kenyon College, *Chairman*; President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College; Dean William C. DeVane, Yale University; President George N. Shuster, Hunter College; Dean Martin ten Hoor, University of Alabama; (1952) President Victor L. Butterfield, Wesleyan University; President Paul S. Havens, Wilson College; President Byron S. Hollinshead, Coe College; Director Charles E. Odegard, American Council of Learned Societies; President Nathan M. Pusey, Lawrence College; (1953) President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; Vice President Harlan Hatcher, Ohio State University; President Charles S. Johnson, Fisk University; President James F. Maguire, Xavier University (Cincinnati); President Gilbert F. White, Haverford College.

COMMISSION ON MINORITY GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: (1951) President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University; President Charles W. Cole, Amherst College; President Rosemary Park, Connecticut College; President Paul C. Reinert, St. Louis University; (1952) Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne, Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, *Chairman*; President Hurst R. Anderson, Hamline University; President George H. Armacost, University of Redlands; President J. Hillis Miller, University of Florida; (1953) President Rollo C. LaPorte, University of Dubuque; President Douglas McGregor, Antioch College; President Charles F. Phillips, Bates College; President Andrew G. Truxal, Hood College.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS: (1951) President Raymond Walters, University of Cincinnati, *Chairman*; President Detlev W. Bronk, Johns Hopkins University; President Arthur S. Flemming, Ohio Wesleyan University; Director Frederick Hochwalt, National Catholic Educational Association;

(1952) President Julius S. Bixler, Colby College; President Umphrey Lee, Southern Methodist University; President Florence M. Read, Spelman College; President Harold Taylor, Sarah Lawrence College; (1953) President Margaret Clapp, Wellesley College; President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; President Walter C. Giersbach, Pacific University; President Dale D. Welch, Alma College.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: (1951) President W. W. Whitehouse, Albion College, *Chairman*; Sister Annette, College of St. Catherine; President Harry K. Newburn, University of Oregon; Dean Charles H. Thompson, Howard University; (1952) President Sarah G. Blanding, Vassar College; President George A. Bowman, Kent State University; President Russell D. Cole, Cornell College; Chancellor John Davis Williams, University of Mississippi; (1953) President Paul R. Anderson, Pennsylvania College for Women; President Carey Croneis, Beloit College; President Roswell G. Ham, Mount Holyoke College; President Merrill J. Holmes, Illinois Wesleyan University.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: (1951) Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University; (1952) President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University; (1953) President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*; The Vice President, *ex officio*; The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Can Americans Continue Living Together†, <i>Vincent J. Flynn</i>	7
Economic Cooperation Administration, <i>Paul G. Hoffman</i>	16
Great Teaching and the Religious Spirit, <i>William T. Mulloy</i>	23
The Idea of a College, <i>D. Elton Trueblood</i>	29
Good Teaching and Public Relations, <i>Eleanor M. O'Byrne</i>	37
The Unfinished Business of Great Teaching, <i>John W. Davis</i>	44
The Overplus of Good Teaching, <i>Francis P. Gaines</i>	50
The National Commission on Accrediting, <i>Cloyd H. Marvin</i>	53
Observations of an American Educator in Europe 1949, <i>Conrad Bergendoff</i>	65
Commission on Financing Higher Education, <i>John D. Millett</i>	72
Interdependence of Education and Industry, <i>Wallace F. Bennett</i>	76
Workshops Improve College Teaching, <i>N. E. Bingham</i>	85
Student Government as a University President Sees It, <i>Irvin Stewart</i>	90
The New Look: The Classroom Lecturer Is Not Obsolete, <i>Philip J. Green</i>	98
The Function of Morgan State College as a State Institution of Higher Education, <i>Martin D. Jenkins</i>	105
A University Program for International Understanding, <i>W. J. Kitchen</i>	119
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR	
Report of Executive Director, <i>Guy E. Snavely</i>	129
Report of Board of Directors	136
Report of Treasurer, <i>LeRoy E. Kimball</i>	138
Report of Commission on the Arts, <i>R. H. Fitzgerald</i>	142
Report of Commission on Christian Higher Education, <i>Robert N. DuBose</i>	144
Report of Commission on International Cultural Relations, <i>Ben M. Cherrington</i>	155
Report of Commission on Minority Groups in Higher Education, <i>George W. McClelland</i>	159
Report of Commission on Public Relations, <i>Raymond Walters</i>	162
Report of Commission on Teacher Education, <i>W. W. Whitehouse</i>	164
Report of Meeting of Presidents' Wives, <i>Ruth Kelley Montgomery</i>	168
THE OFFICIAL RECORDS	
Minutes of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting	171
Members of the Association	179
Constitution and By-Laws	197
Former Presidents of the Association	201
Editorial Notes	202
Among the Colleges	208
New College Presidents	212

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, October and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

CAN AMERICANS CONTINUE LIVING TOGETHER?

VINCENT J. FLYNN

PRESIDENT, COLLEGE OF ST. THOMAS

IT IS a pleasure and an honor to speak to you as president of the Association of American Colleges. I am proud of the Association; I am proud to have been its president during the past year.

First of all, I am proud of being president of the Association for a personal reason. Quite naturally it is gratifying to me to feel that I have the esteem and friendship of my colleagues. It is naturally a matter of some satisfaction, that, after having been on the Board for three years, my fellow college presidents would ask me to be their president. But apart from this personal satisfaction, which I, being human, have no desire to suppress, there is another consideration involved of far greater importance.

I take pleasure in being a member of this organization because to me it seems to furnish an example of the unity and harmony so badly lacking in our nation, and in the world at large. In our deliberations, there are, of course, differences of opinion, but I know of no similar organization where there is less friction and more fundamental good will than our own; and I think it a tribute to the fair-mindedness of the membership of the Association, which is predominantly Protestant, that they should have chosen for their president a priest of the Catholic Church.

Man is by nature one. That is the teaching of any theology that I know of, and sociology, as well; that is to say, human beings are essentially the same. This does not mean, of course, that all are alike in every respect; in fact, it is part of the mystery and fascination of life that no two human beings are alike in all respects. But when we say that all men were created equal, we mean that men in their very essence are the same, regardless of race, color or creed. Christianity teaches that we were all created by the same Father, all redeemed by His Son and that we all have a common destiny.

Until recent years, this concept of the oneness of man, although admitted speculatively, had not been brought into the realm of practical political thinking. A little over a century ago,

Tennyson, dipping into the future, saw a vision of "the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world." The first faint realization of his dream was, of course, the League of Nations. Today, with the extraordinarily rapid development of transportation and communication, as well as the discovery of new means of destruction, there is a more urgent clamor than ever before for world unification of some sort. We have our United Nations organization, struggling bravely to maintain its existence, in the face of enormous difficulties; we have the World Federalists, who wish to go a step further; because of our recognition of the mutual interdependence of nations, we in the United States are trying to help Europe get back on its feet. It is becoming increasingly clear that the problems of one nation are the problems of all; that, in fact, we are our brothers' keepers.

To achieve world unity is, of course, a colossal task. The difficulties are all too obvious. But this is no excuse for abandoning the attempt.

If world unity is a good thing, obviously unity within a nation is a good thing, and, likewise, within the separate political and social units of the nation—the various states or territories, the counties, the cities, the families. Anything which sets a man's heart against his brother is wrong; anything that binds him to his brother in charity is good; and because I believe that the Association of American Colleges falls into the second category, I think that it is good.

Now it would be, indeed, an extremely optimistic person who would expect perfect harmony among all men for any length of time. But that does not lessen, in my opinion, the moral obligation of mankind to strive for this goal. And there is always the possibility of a certain amount of success! Even the most pessimistic would admit that.

If we are to have any success in achieving unity and harmony among men, we shall need first to discover what it is that divides and separates them. To me it seems that the answer lies in the very nature of man as he exists today. Briefly, man, as we know him, is an imperfect creature both in his intellect and in his will. Men disagree because in many matters the truth is by no means immediately evident; its discovery is often a long, tedious process. Men differ in intellectual powers, as well as in the cultivation of

those powers. Only God is all-wise; only He comprehends truth in its fulness. And men disagree also because of an exaggerated selfishness in their hearts. Most of us, according to Aristotle, follow our senses rather than our reason in competing for "wealth, honors, and bodily pleasures." It is the exceptional man, says Aristotle, who is truly a lover of self, in desiring that he should always "act justly, temperately, or in accordance with any of the other virtues," and in general in trying "to secure for himself the honorable course." And from the imperfect understanding of an issue by an imperfect intellect, and from an inclination towards an irrational selfishness, come the deforming passions of fear, of anger, of hatred, of the desire for revenge.

These are the things, in my opinion, which divide and separate man from man.

The next question is, what kind of unity do we want, and how can we achieve it?

I think that we may as well face the fact that we are not likely soon to get the whole race, or our whole nation, or our whole city, to agree on anything. Ideally, of course, if we accept the theistic position, we should all have the same faith. But actually we live in a world filled with Buddhists, Mohammedans, Shintoists, Jews, and so forth, not to speak of the various Christian bodies. All believe in some sort of Supreme Being, all have some sort of moral code. If we are ever to have "one world," or anything like it, we must, I think, first accept the fact of diversity, and, secondly, we must tackle the problem with charity as our basic attitude. We shall need, to be sure, our experts in politics, economics and sociology, but all of our technicians will avail us nothing unless we work together in a spirit of mutual love. Let me explain what I mean.

When I use the word "charity" or "love" as existing between man and man, I mean that one has a desire for the total good of the other. Life, as someone has said, consists in a series of relationships with other persons. The relationships are not between ideas; they are between human beings. Now, it is quite possible for me to love a man while hating his ideas. According to the precept of Christ, we must therefore love even our enemies, and do good to those that hate us. We need not agree with the ideas of our enemies, or with the things that they do. But we must

wish their well-being in time and in eternity, and be willing to do anything within reason to help them attain it. And the reason for this is the unity of the race—we are all children of the one Father. Until the leaven of this idea somehow permeates the mass of men, or at least their leaders, international unity will have, I fear, very little chance.

The same is true, I believe, with regard to national unity, state unity, civic unity and even family unity. You may begin at the top or the bottom of the scale, but you will find no real unity in a body of men without charity. Differences and disagreements will exist, even in the best of families. But I appeal to your experience: where love is present, agreement can usually be reached—at least in the field of action, if not in that of opinion. Where love is not present, no unity is likely. There may be uniformity, or conformity, enforced by the police. Totalitarian states try to reach unity through this method. But it is a method repugnant to all that we Americans cherish.

Since ours is a national organization, let us look for a moment at the present state of our nation, from the point of view of national unity. We find here in America persons of the most widely diverse ancestry, representing all, I daresay, of the races of men, and holding various political and religious beliefs. Whether we wish it or not, this diversity is going to continue for a long time. Can there be any harmony in this Pentecostal population?

I think that there can be. During the war, Americans exhibited a high degree of unity indeed. The political parties got together on a bi-partisan program; labor and capital buried their differences; army and navy chaplains of different faiths worked side by side, and there was comparative peace between their various co-religionists. But now that the emergency—that particular emergency, the threat of utter destruction—has passed we are demonstrating to the world that as a people we can quarrel among ourselves as lustily as the next.

While I deplore any unseemly disputes, of course, in the realms of politics and economics, I am not nearly so troubled by them as I am by those in the realm of religion. And here the situation is none too good. In recent years there has been a resurgence of bad feeling between Protestants and Catholics in the United

States. Without attempting to fix the blame, we can all agree, I am sure, that the fact is highly regrettable. It is regrettable because, as I have already said, anything that sets brother against brother is regrettable; and it is especially regrettable because it gives scandal to the unbeliever, who, like ourselves—according to Christian teaching—has been made to the image and likeness of God. But is he likely to abandon his unbelief and join our ranks when he sees us quarreling like heathens? Woe to him by whom scandal cometh. “Which Christianity?” is the question the puzzled pagan asks when we invite him to accept the faith of Christ. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.

Now what can we possibly do to keep the peace between persons of different religious faiths? Shall we fight it out with firearms? Few, I hope, wish that solution. Shall we send missionaries to each other? In a sense, we are always doing precisely that. By our lives (God forgive us) as well as by our words, we are trying to persuade others of the correctness of our views. But what if we cannot? Must we then accuse each other of bad faith? Hardly. The Christian believes that it is only God Himself who can scrutinize the secrets of the human heart; for that matter, any man of sense will agree that he cannot with certainty know the motives of another.

What program then shall we recommend? The program that men of good will have always followed; the program that even civilized pagans have followed, at least to a degree. We shall not go about picking quarrels about doctrinal differences, but we shall try to cooperate with each other in matters that affect the common good. I do not mean that doctrinal differences are unimportant. They are important, unless truth is unimportant. But we must accept the fact that, for the present at least, we must live in a world of many religious faiths. The question is, How can we live and work together without compromising our integrity?

One answer is that we are already doing it, both in America and abroad. For years it has been common to see Catholics and Protestants working side by side in matters of civic and community concern—the Red Cross, the community chests, school boards, city improvement committees, and so forth. Similarly

we find both banded together for their common good in labor unions, in the National Association of Manufacturers, in business houses, in the various associations of professional men. For centuries, this has been true among men devoted to the fine arts, and for almost as long, I should say, among scholars.

Let me give you an instance from my own experience. Some years ago I had the privilege of spending fifteen months in various libraries in England, France, Italy, Germany, Austria and Belgium. At Oxford, Cambridge and the British Museum, I was treated with the same courtesy as I found at the Vatican library. And similarly in the libraries of France, Germany, Belgium and Austria, when I seldom knew whether I was speaking to a devout Catholic, a devout Protestant, a Jew, a free-thinking agnostic or a professed atheist. And when I was at the Vatican I learned that the building had recently been repaired by the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, because the members of the Foundation had regarded the library as promoting peace—scholars from all lands use it—and that money from the same source was being provided to pay for a new card catalog. And this fact is also instructive: when I was about to leave London for Rome, I was given a letter of introduction to an official in the Vatican library by a Jewish scholar from the University of Heidelberg, who happened to be working in the British Museum at the time, and no one, either at the Museum or at the Vatican, thought it odd. Of course I could probably have got into the Vatican library through other channels; but the point is that my friend in London had a friend at the Vatican, and he wished me to receive special attention! Furthermore, when I mentioned to the officials at the Vatican the names of two of my friends at the University of Chicago (where I received my degree), Professors Charles H. Beeson and B. L. Ullman, I was treated with added respect: Mr. Ullman had been for years a correspondent of the then pope, Pius XI, when the latter was librarian at Milan, and later in the Vatican; Mr. Beeson, under whom I had studied, was recognized abroad as one of the two or three leading paleographers in America.

But, it may be pointed out, our present-day religious quarrels are due, not so much to doctrinal differences, as to the feeling of one body that its interests are being threatened by another, or

a fear that they may be threatened in the future. To be specific, some Protestants in the United States fear that if Catholics ever became strong enough to do so, they would deny freedom of worship to persons of other religious faiths. And some Catholics have a paralyzing fear of certain Protestant organizations.

Now there is historical reason for fear, I admit, in both instances. For various reasons, civil liberties have not developed throughout the world as they have in the United States. But, to my mind, the important question is this: are we in this country likely to follow exactly the same pattern in human relations as that which has been followed elsewhere?

Personally, I do not think so. I believe that most of the Protestants I know have no desire to curb my freedom of worship. And I trust that most of the Catholics I know are equally fair.

American history, I believe, supports the view that we are, in truth, a freedom-loving people, and that we are steadily making advances in the domain of human rights. Our forefathers came to this country, not to think alike in political and religious matters, but to live peaceably with their own convictions. No matter what has happened elsewhere, I believe that we in America have developed, and that we can in the future further develop, so strongly our understanding of the rights of the individual conscience that no fear in this regard need be felt by anyone. I feel that we Americans can learn to live together in peace. If we are to look at the matter realistically, the cross-currents of interest—political, economic and social—are so diverse in America that people here are not, in the main, arrayed for or against each other chiefly on religious grounds. And I doubt, too, whether, in the foreseeable future, any responsible religious body would wish to enslave another. For that would mean that the majority of Americans would be reversing their thinking completely; and it takes a long time indeed for people to make such a shift. And the mere fact that we Americans are gradually getting to know each other better, helps the situation enormously: it is usually the stranger whom we dislike and mistrust.

Another reason for optimism in this matter, I think, is the development in some quarters of a new approach to the question of religious differences. Whereas some persons have begun the discussion by declaring that error had no rights, others have been

pointing out that rights inhere in persons, not in abstractions; and that all persons, even those in error in their thinking, have rights; and that, furthermore, we must be extremely careful of the rights of the individual conscience even when it is in error. Reduced to practical terms, this means that for every person his conscience is the guide which he must follow, even though he be objectively in error. For example, if a college instructor's conscience tells him—however erroneously—that he must liquidate the president of the institution, then he is morally bound to do so. Certain inconveniences, to be sure, result from this doctrine; but it is still sound, according to my theological friends. The doctrine of the rights of the erroneous conscience is, of course, recognized in the prevalent attitude towards conscientious objectors to military service; most people regard the position of the objectors as erroneous, but still respect their right to act according to their own convictions. The same doctrine underlies the legislation in some churches, among them my own, which forbids members to baptize a person against his will, even though these churches regard the person in objective error if he does not wish to be baptized.

There are, to be sure, people in this country who would impose an artificial harmony upon us by trying to make us all agree upon everything. As a step towards this idealistic condition, they would do away with the private educational institutions. They would say, for example, that it is wrong for the Lutherans, the Baptists, the Catholics and other religious denominations to have their own colleges; they hold that such a condition makes for division among our people. But if I understand my history correctly, the early settlers came to America so that they might believe as they saw fit, in matters political, economic, religious and otherwise. And since they themselves founded church colleges, I think that they would most heartily applaud our having colleges today maintained by the different denominations.

Why do I speak about these matters to college administrators? Because I think that they are relatively free from the prejudices which militate against our national unity; because I think that they have been foremost in the fight for a true unity, a unity based on understanding and sympathy, not force; because I think that, by virtue of their position, they can do more than any

other body of men of like size to promote this idea of unity; because I think that they have given an admirable example, in this Association especially, of the patient forbearance and of the Christian charity which must underlie all our efforts to effect peace and harmony among Americans, and among all the peoples of the earth.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

PAUL G. HOFFMAN

ADMINISTRATOR

I FEEL sure that I have at least one thing in common with most college presidents. To me, and I think to you, a billion dollars looks like a lot of money. In my opinion, that is the way a billion dollars ought to look. It is a lot of money. It is so much money that some people are inclined to doubt whether anything which costs that much can possibly be worth it.

As you can imagine, I meet up with that kind of doubt about the Economic Cooperation Administration. Through the ECA, the United States is already committed for the expenditure of not one, but ten billion dollars. To finish the job may cost us five billions more. It is no wonder that thoughtful taxpaying Americans want to know whether, at such a cost, the job is worth finishing. That's the question I want to try to answer tonight. I want to answer it, first of all, because it is our money—yours and mine—that is being spent. I want to answer it also because of my conviction, a conviction that is rooted in the facts about the world we live in, that it is our future and nothing less than that that is involved in spending it.

Everyone of us has a vital stake in knowing just what the Economic Cooperation Administration is, just what it is up against, and exactly what in America's behalf it is achieving. We have a dollars-and-cents stake in knowing that. And we also have a stake which cannot be reckoned in dollars, even in billions of dollars.

The basis for the answers to those questions can be found in the fact that the ECA today is not only what it started out to be, it is much more than that. It is true that through ECA, America's dollars are being used for foreign aid; but it is not true—in fact, it is dangerously untrue—to describe ECA any longer merely as foreign aid or to regard it any longer as merely a foreign aid program. The truth is that ECA has become a first line of defense for western civilization. It is a first line of defense not only for America's freedoms, for America's free insti-

tutions, but for freedoms and free institutions everywhere. It is a first line of defense against those who ceaselessly aim and plot and threaten to destroy democracy. To regard ECA as any less than that, is to reveal a perilous lack of knowledge about the menacing facts of our world. It is to reveal a perilous lack of understanding of what is required of us if we are to defend our freedoms so that children of free men can live in that world in peace.

Now, it is neither by chance nor by design that ECA has become a first line of democracy's defense. It has become that under the pressure of dire events. We did not bring those events to pass, but America can no more escape their consequences than America could escape the consequences of Pearl Harbor.

The first broad principles which led to ECA were laid down by General Marshall, then Secretary of State, in his historic speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. In that speech, General Marshall called upon the nations of Europe to join in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economic health as the only means whereby political stability could be restored, progress resumed and freedom once more set firmly on its feet. For our part in that undertaking, General Marshall declared that the Government of the United States stood ready to "do whatever it is able to do to assist." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer. It was an offer made in good faith. It was backed by good will. Its sole objective was a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be more secure. And when that offer was made, we believed—or at least we hoped—that that was an objective which every government shared and that that was a task in which every government would be not merely willing but eager to join.

The nations of Europe quickly accepted our challenge. In Paris, hardly a week after General Marshall's speech, the representatives of most of the European nations east and west met to accept our offer and began to turn that challenge into practical fact. That meeting was attended by the representative of the Soviet Union in the person of Mr. Molotov, its foreign minister. It looked for the moment as though, on this technical and desperately urgent level of economic recovery, something close to joint cooperative action for the common good was about to be

achieved. For three days, Molotov attended that Paris meeting and for those three days the hopes of freedom-loving, peace-seeking nations ran high. Then on the third day Molotov, with his entourage of satellites in tow, walked out of the meeting and enplaned for Moscow.

That departure, as we now know, was not merely another uncouth communist gesture. We know now—as Walter Lippman so trenchantly said—that it was a declaration of a “cold war.” It was a declaration of war by world communism against recovery in the free world. And the issues brought into conflict by that declaration were no less momentous for us because the tactics employed were those of a cold war rather than a hot war.

Make no mistake about it. When the leaders of the Soviet Union and of world Communism declared war on recovery in Western Europe, they knew coldly and precisely what they were doing. Their aim to make the whole world Communist is no secret aim; it is written down for anyone to read; it has never been denied; it is continually being reaffirmed. And these men, being realists, know the conditions which are essential to Communist success. They know that free and prosperous peoples do not choose voluntarily to pass under the Communist yoke—no free and prosperous people ever have. The conditions essential to Communist conquest are hunger, and misery, and hopelessness. The more hunger and misery and hopelessness, the more likelihood of Communist success. Mr. Molotov, when he enplaned for Moscow, and all of Mr. Molotov’s colleagues knew perfectly well that if the Marshall Plan were to succeed then the Communist Program of World Conquest would be placed in great jeopardy.

At the time of that Paris Conference in mid-1947, Mr. Molotov had good reason to believe that recovery could be halted. Europe’s productive machine, shattered in the war, was no more than patched up and pieced together. Industrial production was lagging, and owing partly to bad weather, a crop failure was in prospect. Too many people were hungry and there was far too much unrest and despair.

Throughout much of Western Europe, a powerful, highly trained, highly disciplined Communist Party was already mobilized and prepared at a signal from Moscow to use every weapon in the Communist arsenal to intensify Europe’s hunger and un-

rest and despair in order that those evils could be turned to more evil account.

On his return to Moscow, Mr. Molotov gave the signal and the cold war was on. Ever since and unceasingly, the Communists have used sabotage. They have used riots. They have used Moscow-directed strikes. They have flooded Europe with vicious, lying, poisonous propaganda. And back of all this they have spread terror with the dark threat of a march by the Red Army.

That is the world in which the Economic Cooperation Administration was called on to operate. That is the breach in which America was called to stand. That is what the ECA has been up against. That is the cold war in which the ECA has been a first line of defense. Now we need to know in what manner and with what success that defense has been conducted and that line held.

The weapons we have used in the cold war have been very different from the weapons of the Communists. As vastly different as our faith and our objectives are different from theirs.

Our faith is in man as an individual. Our objective is that kind of society in which men as individuals can live in decency and dignity, a society in which free inquiry and free institutions, such as our colleges and universities, can flourish. Only weapons suitable to such objectives could be used by ECA.

We knew also, of course, that only the people of Europe could save Europe. We could help, but we knew that our role was that of helping them to help themselves. We have fought hunger with food; we have helped increase production both in plants and on farms by providing materials and tools; we have fought against lying propaganda with the truth, and nothing but the truth. Such have been the weapons we have used to restore confidence, to revive hope and to help the people of Europe lift themselves by their own efforts and their growing strength beyond the reach of either the lure or the threats of Communism.

And with what success has this unique campaign met? Perhaps my best answer is a quote from Anne O'Hare McCormick:—

Anyone who compares the picture today with that of 1947 can hardly believe that such progress could be made in two years. A miracle of recovery has been performed. To look back and see where Europe was when the war ended and

where it would be now without American support, is to understand what the European Recovery Program has done for its beneficiaries—and for the United States.

To Mrs. McCormick's appraisal, may I add my own? Due to—and I repeat myself deliberately—the very great efforts of the Europeans themselves, the Communists are losing their battle to perpetuate hunger and misery and hopelessness in country after country, Communist-engineered riots have flopped; Communist-engineered strikes have miserably failed; and Communist propaganda and hate and lying have begun to backfire. Europe is recovering. Today, on an average, agricultural and industrial production is again up to the level of 1938. In fact, during 1949, levels of European industrial production reached an all-time peak. Today there are jobs and the people of these countries are working at them. There are tools of production and the people are using them productively. There are more things to buy and more of the means to buy them with. And as a result, the most powerful forces at work today are courage and self-confidence and hope.

This should be remembered: Every step that Europe takes toward recovery is, as the Communists knew it would be, a step away from Communism and toward the strengthening of freedom and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Events are proving that the Communists' fears as to the effects of recovery on their plans were well founded. Indeed, in these two years there have been many elections in these western European nations. The Communists, just when they thought they were on the threshold of their greatest gains have lost every one of those elections. More than that, in every one of them the Communist vote has been dramatically reduced.

But we must not exaggerate the extent of our gains. The Communists who are realists know full well the significance of this fight for recovery that is going on in Europe. They know that as of the present that fight is being won by the free nations. But they know also, and you and I as Americans must face this fact, that the "cold war" even in Europe is not yet won. Freedom is being strengthened, but freedom is not yet secure. There is a better chance for peace, but we cannot yet be sure of it.

The Communists know that Europe is still faced with the stu-

pendous problem of earning more dollars than she is now earning if she is to have the dollars she needs to buy the goods and services she can obtain only in the Western Hemisphere. They know that as long as the western European economy remains compartmentalized by trade barriers, recovery will be uncertain and the prospects dim for building in western Europe that more dynamic expanding economy which alone can bring a steady improvement in the conditions of life for all its people. They know that Europe's economy grew to greatness when its trade was free and competitive. They know that if it is ever to achieve that greatness again, compartmentalization must give way to integration and that the chokeweeds of high tariffs, cartels and import and exchange controls must be swept aside.

The men of the Kremlin know that if the Marshall Plan should be stopped mid-way, or that if appropriations were reduced too drastically, progress both toward building up dollar earnings and toward the more enduring task of economic integration in Europe would be disastrously slowed down. They know also that in some countries a sharp reduction in Marshall Plan Aid would bring a return to short rations and a stoppage of the tooling programs now under way. Above all, they know that if as a result of our quitting they can bring a division among the free peoples once again, a situation will have been created where a dictator can divide and conquer. Is it any wonder that they are eagerly awaiting word that the dollars needed to carry on the Marshall Plan will not be forthcoming? This is their great hope.

Of course, even if the needed dollars are forthcoming, no one can guarantee that western Europe will take advantage of that aid sharply to step up her dollar earnings or boldly to reduce trade barriers and thus start to integrate her economies. But this is the historic moment when those goals must be won if they are to be won. Later, the heads of governments in Europe may have neither aid from the west nor threats from the east to help them overcome the natural aversion to change. Later, it may be too late to start building that new continent in western Europe which will be so strong and whose free people will be so prosperous that no dictator would dare march against them.

It is my hope that before Marshall aid ends that Europe will be well on the road toward achieving the goals which I have set

forth. It is also my hope that the Russians will wait in vain for word that America is either pulling out or pulling down its aid to too low a level. I hold these hopes for Europe because Europe has already produced one miracle and can produce another. I hold these hopes for America because I am an American. It is not in the American tradition to fail to finish a job. Faced with a crisis it is not in the American tradition to give up. It is our American tradition to stand by our guns, to carry on and to see it through. And if we do—if we stand steadfast—there is a sound basis for the great hope that the free world will regain the initiative and in the second half of this 20th century, resume its forward march.

GREAT TEACHING AND THE RELIGIOUS SPIRIT

WILLIAM T. MULLOY

BISHOP OF STEUBENVILLE

AT ANY moment of time man is able to look forward or backward with an evaluative eye, but it is, of course, most tempting to undertake such a reconnaissance at the turn of a century or of a half-century. Like many another person, I have been leafing through the pages of some of our weekly magazines that are breathless with the imminence of a new year, 1950, a year that brings us to an historic time of decision, when civilization is upon the verge of greatness or nothingness depending upon our capacity to envisage the future in terms of our best understanding of the past. I found it tremendously stimulating to read in one large weekly the statement that the American of 1950 is, perhaps, outgrowing the philosophy of William James that had been accepted so completely during the last fifty years, a philosophy which held that the perfect pragmatist was one who turned from fixed principles, closed systems and pretended absolutes and origins. The pragmatist turned instead towards concreteness and adequacy, towards facts, towards action and towards power. But in 1950 the American finds that of action and power he has had abundant experience, experience which appears now to be insufficient for a rule of life; and of concreteness, which does not serve as a compelling and satisfying ideal.

To bury his dead with pride and dignity, to arm the living with hope as well as a gun, to comfort his brain as well as his belly, this American is inclined to seek out fixed principles. He is doggedly determined to probe for those absolutes—real, not pretended—by which he may be judged and which distinguish his cause from 'the nation that is not holy.'¹

These are comforting words even though they represent the analysis of only one writer. There is this drawback, however; they may not indicate as wide a shift in the pattern of thought as their author indicates. Only a few weeks ago, the educational

¹ Allan Nevins, "The Audacious Americans," *Life*, Vol. 28 #1, Jan. 2, 1950, p. 85.

world was paying great honor to Mr. John Dewey on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday. The praise that was heaped upon him by a large number of distinguished teachers and administrators indicated that Mr. Dewey is regarded as the outstanding American philosopher and educator. But John Dewey is the perfect disciple of William James, and has carried the ideas of his master to their logical outcomes. Now those who paid such extravagant tribute to John Dewey either understood his philosophy or they did not. If they understood it, then pragmatism is still fastened upon our land with the grip of an octopus; if they did not understand the man they praised, then it is possible that they were desirous of accepting the "philosophy of democracy" without thoroughly studying the real Dewey or the implications of his position.

A thoughtful economist² in his analysis of the signs of the times finds that as the second half of the twentieth century comes up, we see ourselves caught in a hodgepodge of scientific achievement and irrational conduct, of high ideals and low-grade performance, of industrial aptitude and political confusion. Apparently, if modern man has three orders of thought—the economic, the social and the moral—then these make for mixed motives and objectives, and frequently for cross-purposes. Economic man, having reached an impasse, blocked by mistaken loyalties, wrong evaluations and deceptive leadership, now turns to the social and the moral order. In a sense, social man has been groomed for the job, but moral man comes into the picture reluctantly. Apparently, not very many men have learned with Churchill that "those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other."

There are those, however, who remain convinced that it is social pressure rather than law that changes business conduct. From 1900 until now, one finds the smug, self-satisfying belief that change always moves in an upward direction. Subscribers to such concepts look upon the dictators and evil leaders of the last fifty years as mere deviations from normal mankind, and find no fault, then, in waiting for pragmatic philosophy to turn this world into a human heaven, refusing meanwhile to believe that

² Walter Sonneberg writing in *Human Events*, Dec. 28, 1949, Vol. VI, No. 52.

evil is a problem or that safety and security based on such low norms of living are vain human hopes.

That "there is nothing new under the sun" is an axiom that can turn to this year of the mid-century for confirmation. Here we are, with the wit and wisdom of the mid-way mark of the twentieth century to support as well as confound us, turning back to an older and perhaps more profound learning of the past, and finding ourselves in agreement that great teaching is the essence of a liberal education. We seem to be in accord on the principle that in the educative process there must be a teacher to teach and a learner to be taught; we accept, I take it, and rightly so, the thesis that there is a cultural heritage to be handed down to the neophyte by the teacher who engages in this process with all humility, and, perhaps, even with a sense of unworthiness.

Although we are still surrounded by the vestiges and remnants of a formerly more militant pragmatism, I believe that we have successfully confined the overt forms of progressive education to the limbo of unredeemed ideas. Soft pedagogy, as far as I am concerned, means a soft, fat, sated mediocrity; hard pedagogy, on the other hand, if its sternness merely gives lip service to honest discipline, means nothing; what we seek is a reasoned and reasonable discipline that will help a man to be tolerant of the shortcomings of others while he becomes highly intolerant of his own.

Great teaching can come only from great teachers. Is the intellectual life on our college campus today conducive to the breeding and encouragement of great teachers? One critic³ has said that the liberal university is a collection of people lacking common convictions, pursuing unrelated specialisms and using their supposed 'neutrality' as a pretext for evading discussion of fundamental and controversial questions. If this be a true picture, then we are on the verge of destroying good teaching. Perhaps our institutions of learning have undertaken to do too much and have accomplished the undesired purpose of doing nothing well. Colleges have tried to produce scholars, specialists and researchers, responsible citizens, aesthetes, athletes, technicians, leaders,

³ Dr. Dorothy Emmett, quoted in "What Is a Christian College" by Dr. C. A. Holbrook. *Social Action*, Sept. 15, 1949, Vol. 15, #7.

followers, independent thinkers, solid characters, believers in the democratic spirit, proponents of humanistic values, good Christians and hosts of other products which, in themselves, may be desirable but which, due to the manner of their production, may lead to the loss of college integrity because of the multitude of mutually exclusive ends. Colleges may fall victim to what C. A. Holbrook has called their belief in their own 'omnicompetence.'

The worship of "pure reason" has jeopardized good teaching on many a campus. In an age of high emphasis on the accomplishments of science, there has been a notable decrease in research in philosophical and social areas. Now I would take nothing away from the magnificent accomplishments of science, but with others I must point out that the failure to study man philosophically in his own social environment will lead, all too soon, to an imbalance that may never be righted again. If the oversight in socio-philosophical areas is merely one of neglect, then that situation can be remedied; but if the lack of interest comes from a false conviction that only in science is there salvation, then we are faced with a more profound problem. If in the interest of so-called pure reason we let teaching bog down into scientism, then we will have created a man-centered rationalism that can only lead students to conclude that man's institutions, with some scientific leadership, will carry him ever onward and upward to that human heaven I referred to earlier in these remarks. I am moved to say here that some men are so fearful of the world of philosophy that they seem to evade it lest they be accused of having been introduced to it by Chancellor Hutchins.

While I am a strong proponent of philosophy as a fundamental part of the stuff of great teaching, I am also an admirer and supporter of science. I note with approval that we are getting closer to the reality of a national science foundation. I, too, fear that the social sciences may be neglected, but it is entirely too easy a remedy to turn to government and ask that social science research be given a small grant in the national science foundation measure, or that a separate measure be created to establish a social science foundation. It seems to me erroneous to suggest such an easy solution to the study of the fears that plague our times. I have before me men who have influence with the great foundations and with those who control financial empires. Why cannot private initia-

tive create its own foundation to study the social and moral needs and shortcomings of our century? Of great laboratories and physical facilities we have no crying need; we need great minds with time to think, time to analyze and time to create a synthesis that can be the intellectual *Magna Charta* of this day. It seems to me that an association such as yours might be the sponsors of such a project. Failing here, I pray that we may not lose by default sound leadership in the ethical, moral and social fields.

I plead for a review of the social philosophy of the present and some fundamental research in these areas because some of the social "ideas" I meet today are about as "social" as a hungry lion and just about as desirable to live with. In days of hard realism and hard money, why is it that the philosopher has so little to add to our thinking that is not merely mercenary or mercantile? Business is looking for something to substitute for its philosophy of service, but two or three researchers on the staff of *Fortune* are not going to build the cornerstone for business ethics or mold a philosophy for international trade.

While we are touching the subject of philosophical shortcomings in the field of social sciences it seems opportune to note a threat to one of the most important social sciences, education. There is more than an indication that education is being tempted to declare itself singly and devotedly the handmaiden of a new religion, democracy.

There are those who would embrace this new religion and who turn snarlingly on the "reactionaries" who would like to keep intact the dictionary definitions both of religion and of education. Modern science itself would eschew the sloppy thinking of these definition changers, but they insist, paradoxically, on leaning upon science to justify their threadbare pragmatism and their world of shifting terminology.

I give place to no man in my admiration for an allegiance to democratic action and democratic procedures, but I hold that democracy is most meaningful and true when it is built on the basis of Christian affirmations. My Christian faith affirms God's righteous rule over life, a sovereignty which depends upon no finite entity nor any sanction of the state. Quite candidly, I want the college and the teacher to impart facts and values of the Christian religion, which for me means that the knowledge of Christi-

anity will be a part of the learning process. I want religion related to the transmission of the cultural heritage, and I want to see the influence of religion made and felt in the college as well as in the community. And finally, I want to see Christianity lived because it has been taught as a living process and not just as an ordering of inert facts.

It is my conviction that we need not only a resurgence of faith but an ability—a tutored ability, if you will—to translate this faith into the routine of daily living. And here it is the word “routine” that needs evaluation. By “routine” I do not mean monotony. Monotony kills almost anything whether it be music, art or the desire to live virtuously. A rededication to the life of Christian living is demanded constantly. This rededication cannot come from an impoverished intellect, nor can it come from a mind crowded with the bits and pebbles of an eclectic philosophy which is as encumbered as a Victorian what-not and just about as welcome as such bric-a-brac in a twentieth century drawing room. To empty the mind of trivia and to feed it upon greatness and truth is the challenge that the master teacher must meet before his students. If he teaches for the day, his work will be lost like words written on the sand; but if he teaches for eternity, all posterity will bless him and God will find a special place for him as He has done for all His disciples.

THE IDEA OF A COLLEGE

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, EARLHAM COLLEGE

IN THE preparation of this address for the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges it has given me pleasure to write my notes in the same room in which Dr. Robert L. Kelly made the original plans for the formation of the Association. That Dr. Kelly is acutally here, is an added pleasure.

The most sobering thought that comes to the attention of modern students is the thought that civilizations can pass away. It is a shocking thing for a young person to realize that in parts of North Africa and in parts of western Asia there are now only shifting sands where once there were prosperous and educated populations. The really thoughtful student immediately makes the deduction that our own boasted civilization can likewise perish and that it *will* perish unless a great deal of concerned intelligence is devoted to its preservation. Great as our present wealth and security may be, they are not necessarily permanent.

Now a college, whatever else it may be, is a conscious effort to avoid the decay of civilization and to make that civilization worthy of permanence. Knowing that we are in danger, we have contrived means by which the improvement of civilization may be undertaken. The institution of higher education may be compared to a pumping station on a pipe line. In the great lines from Texas to the northern states we cannot rely on gravity, even when the pipes go downhill, for that is too slow. We must have some means of boosting the process. Places of learning are similarly spaced in our culture and devoted to a similar function.

We are tempted, sometimes, to lump all education together and call it good, saying vaguely that education is what we need. Most of us now are more critical than this, because we realize that education, like religion, can be both good and bad. Religion is not necessarily good and neither is education, if we are to judge by the general effect on human lives. We have to admit that much of our present education, including what is rather hopefully called higher education, is actually shoddy. Not all degrees are

equally valuable, whatever the public may think, and not all colleges are equally concerned with the central task before them. That is one reason why meetings like this are valuable; we must help each other continually to know what the main task is and how to perform it effectively.

All will likewise agree that there is frequently a great difference between our theory and our practice. All education sounds wonderful in college catalogues. There is very little wrong with the catalogues; what we require is some factual resemblance to what they say. Last year I visited more than thirty colleges and universities in this nation and I was frankly dismayed at much that I saw. One result was an address at Denison which, to my surprise, was quoted on the editorial page of *LIFE*. I was surprised because what I said seemed to me a commonplace among those concerned with the actual practice of academic institutions. What I said was that we are graduating people who can barely read and that thousands of those who *can* read, appear to have no standards of excellence about *what* to read. It was and is my conviction that the majority of those who emerge from American institutions of higher learning today have no real sense of life's meaning, and many of them are not vitally concerned with finding any. The great majority, whatever their technological skills, have no grasp of the Judeo-Christian roots of democracy. Much of the same report was made by Sir Richard Livingstone when he said, "The influence of universities on the world is disappointingly limited."

In the face of such confusion and relative failure it is necessary, from time to time, that we know what and where we are. We must reset our compasses. We must know what we are, before we can know our duty. Almost a century ago, John Henry Newman wrote the remarkable lecture-essays to which he gave the title "The Idea of a University." Now, in the middle of this century, we must go on to explore "The Idea of a College." We need this because we are often so vague in our references and almost meaningless in our classifications.

One almost meaningless distinction is between public and private institutions. The usual suggestion here is that the tax-supported institution is public, whereas the others are private. But a little thought should make us realize that public responsi-

bility and public service do not depend on the way funds are raised or on the way Boards are appointed. The institutions which I have served in my teaching career, Guilford, Haverford, Stanford and Earlham, have never, so far as I know, received directly one cent of tax money, but they are definitely public in the way they perform their functions. There could be a private institution, run for profit or for the welfare of a specialized group, but this is not the direction in which we have sought to go. If we are to make a distinction, let it be between governmental institutions and independent foundations.

Even greater confusion is shown in our use of the terms "college" and "university." Often it has been the ambition of colleges to cease to be colleges and become universities. This is on the assumption that a university is bigger and that bigger things are *eo ipso* better. I am afraid that a good many of our citizens think that a university is a *large* or *prosperous* or *ambitious* college. This, of course, we must challenge. It is undoubtedly true that we can, if we choose, emulate Humpty Dumpty in his famous conversation with Alice over the meaning of the word "glory." "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." But in our less arbitrary world of normal experience it is right to have some decent regard to what words have meant before. Historically, it has been agreed that a university is a place of universal knowledge or a collection of colleges. A college, on the other hand, has no necessity of being a place of universal knowledge, for it is primarily a place of *teaching*. *A college is a society*. It is made up of learners and teachers living together for the purpose of human growth. The purpose of a college determines its size and a really large college is a contradiction in terms since the community experience which is basic to the idea is then impossible. A college is a contrived means of bringing to bear maximum beneficent influence to produce maximum progress in the individuals concerned. Ideally, the members of college, both teachers and taught, *work* together, *think* together, *play* together and *pray* together. We must not let our praying remain separate from our thinking or our playing be wholly dissociated from our working. It is the wholeness of life that we consciously and deliberately seek.

It is essential to the idea of a college that the contacts between members outside the lecture room or laboratory may be the most effective of all instruments of growth and are in no sense peripheral. The late Professor Whitehead, one of the best educated men of our time, has told us that, while an undergraduate at Cambridge, he never heard lectures on any subject except mathematics. Where then did he get his extraordinary interest in philosophy, in history and in letters? He got all this, he tells us, by the conversations in the dining hall where he often sat from six to ten, learning rapidly, not only from his equals, but also from his elders and betters. When we think of the eat-and-run procedure of so much of our modern dining, we understand one of our chief sources of failure. It is possible that the invention of the college cafeteria has done more to destroy culture than any other device of the adversary. I wish it were part of every instructor's responsibility to dine in hall at least once a week.

Partly because of unfavorable publicity about crimes in educational institutions and partly by analysis of our total contemporary predicament, we realize that, in our colleges, we cannot sidestep the question of moral influence. The sad and unpleasant truth is that some students are made *worse* by going to college, and sometimes it seems that *many* are. There are institutions where self-sacrificing parents are being cheated, for they send their young people with high hopes, little knowing that in some instances their children are being thrown into situations where the pressure in the direction of downright immorality is terrible.

We need to give intelligent thought to the whole question of moral progress and, fortunately, the main lines here are rather clear. We know that growth in decency and integrity come chiefly, not by direct moral teaching, but rather by general atmosphere, by fellowship in creative work and by first-hand acquaintance with great minds, great books and great art. Perhaps the wisest of all the wisest sayings of Professor Whitehead was this: "Moral progress is impossible apart from the habitual vision of greatness." Here, if anywhere, is a golden text! Our students need to be saved from triviality, but they don't even know what is trivial until they have a vision of greatness to make

the contrast clear. Think what it means to put before young people a great towering figure like John R. Mott, holder of the Nobel Prize for Peace, or a man like Albert Einstein. If we can provide our students with a steady stream of such experiences, we have done for them the best that we shall ever do. Remember that the isolated experience will not ordinarily suffice. Men are lifted when the vision of greatness is *habitual*.

From moral education we move naturally to the place of religion in a college. Of this we may be sure, we must have religion in college, for otherwise we are not concerned with the creation of wholeness. What both students and professors need is the reverence and the commitment to the Living God that can give power to their moral aspirations. Ideally the religion should not be a *part* of the college, but rather an atmosphere of reverence which pervades the entire enterprise. As my colleague, William Clark, has so well said, "The Christian college does not *have* a religious program; it *is* a religious program."

If the religious program is to be a healthy one there must be a continual outflow of energy from the campus. A campus religious organization which exists only for the profit of its own members is already dead, but it may be living if it has an outlet in deputations, in service projects and in a variety of community contacts.

Historically, the college chapel has been the chief college symbol and the focal point of all meaning. Now, unfortunately, this is often greatly changed and many college presidents admit frankly that they do not know what to do with chapel. In many places we are beating a more or less steady retreat, because the life seems to have gone out of what was once noble. I think the way of wisdom here is to take a firm stand, reverse the process of erosion, and make the chapel central again. Otherwise, we become fragmented and cease to be organic communities. I think it is wise to make a clearcut distinction between assemblies and college chapels, to make the former frankly secular and to make the latter unapologetically devout. Above all we must make them *good*, and we must be willing to spend the time, effort and money to achieve this end. In my own college we probably put more concentrated effort into this program than into any other single aspect of college life, and we feel justified in the re-

sults. Attendance is required, but seats are not checked and so far this appeal to mature responsibility is succeeding. It is not succeeding one hundred per cent, but it is better than we dared hope when we began this system a year and a half ago. The result in the lives of the students is sufficient to make us believe the enormous effort is justified.

Naturally, a college will have instruction in religion. It will not be impressed by the curious argument of those who say you cannot have religious instruction because of divisions into denominations and faiths. It is to be noted that those who present this argument are not sufficiently consistent to rule out politics or philosophy on the same grounds. If you have men of moral integrity and real objectivity, they can teach religion in such a way that students gain instruction rather than indoctrination. Certainly such instruction is needed, for today few have any clear idea of what they believe and why.

One of the glories of a college is the possibility of deep friendships between scholars devoted to different disciplines, who can gain enormously from what they learn from one another, but often, in our modern institutions, we have failed to take advantage of this. We then cease to be real colleges and become a set of little departments, each going its own way. In the summer of 1939, shortly before he died, I visited Professor Rendell Harris in England. He was the last survivor of that group of scholars, who, near the end of the nineteenth century, made Johns Hopkins one of the most exciting places on the face of the earth. I took the opportunity to ask the ancient man what was the secret of that amazing burst of intellectual life. "It was very simple," he said, "we all attended each other's lectures." And then he went on to say how it raised a man's sight to have a scholar like Professor Gildersleeve in the room. I am convinced that we could change much of our college atmosphere if the advice of Rendell Harris were generally followed today.

One reason why we cannot do this, or at least think we cannot do this, is that we teach too much. *In the modern college there is too much teaching and not enough learning.* Often the instructor does the work for students when they ought to do it for themselves. We ruin the whole idea when we make it the chief task of a teacher to be a purveyor of information. The informa-

tion is in *books*, for printing has been invented. The teacher is the enkindler; the best he can do is to light a fire. And the greatness of any college is directly proportional to the number of teachers who are truly effective in this sacred function. *The greatest college is the college with the best teachers.*

One of the major tragedies in modern college experience is the lack of friendship between students and teachers. It is our open scandal. I have visited many colleges where there is the frank recognition that the community is broken at this vital point. It is our shame that even in our smaller colleges so few real friendships between students and faculty members exist. A good part of the trouble comes from the side of the student who is self-conscious in the presence of the teacher because he fears the accusation of his fellow students that he is apple-polishing. Apple-polishing is not very bad, but the failure to make friendships is bad indeed, if what we have said about influences is true. It is bad because education, at its best, is not mere information, but rather the communication of truth through the medium of personality. If some demon wanted to do his worst to hinder our process this rift is what he would create and perpetuate.

If we are wise we shall attack this problem at its roots. Much of the trouble arises from the fact that, in our conventional American system of instruction, the same man is both teacher and judge. There is no good reason why this should be so, and much reason why it should not be. One of the best forward steps we could take in our colleges would be in the general introduction of a system of outside examiners. The case for outside examiners lies in the three-fold fact that it (a) raises the sights of the student; (b) raises the sights of the instructor; and (c) improves the relationship between the two, since they become obvious partners in the effort to help the student to do well.

We could provide a system of outside examiners by pooling our resources in certain areas, and thus make a great advance with very little expense. Thus colleges in special areas may move in the direction of the creation of regional universities which perform their first function in the provision of examining boards. Here is a chance for real pioneering in our day. Formerly, distance made it impracticable, but now modern transportation has altered the picture radically. In some such way we may finally

have the advantages of real colleges and real universities at the same time. One result would be that colleges could begin to have effective and beneficent competition in something besides athletics and debating.

Ours is an exciting job. We know full well that we are in a race with catastrophe and that civilization is in jeopardy, but we are fortunate in that there is something that we can do about it. We can deliberately create little islands of hope in the midst of a century of despair. We are doing what we love most.

GOOD TEACHING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

ELEANOR M. O'BYRNE

PRESIDENT, MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE OF THE SACRED HEART

THE four words in this title admit of a bewildering number of combinations. We shall, however, accept the title as it was formulated by the program committee. We shall assume that the administrators here gathered also accept the precise placing of these four words. We shall even go so far as to assume that they agree heartily that good teaching contributes to good public relations. To what degree each subscribes to this statement will, however, never be known, because at the end of this paper there will be neither a quiz period nor a Gallup poll.

For simplicity let us divide an institution's public into two groups, both of which admit of further division. There is the campus-family made up of faculty—which includes staff—and students. The off-campus group is a more complex and also a more extensive public. Those in this big group who are nearest to the college or university, by reason of a direct tie, are the trustees, alumni, parents of alumni and present students. Beyond these groups the college comes into relation with the town or city or metropolitan area in which it is located. It is also in immediate vertical and horizontal contact with industry and the professions. State and Federal governments are now within the orbit of every college's "public." Present indications are that they will continue to be closely associated with the institutions of higher learning of our country. Because of contemporary political organization, we have today a U.N. and a UNESCO, and a rapidly accelerating movement for the exchange of students and professors between countries. Therefore, it is true to say that the entire world is also part of every institution's public. However, let us exclude this world-public from the present discussion and restrict the off-campus public of the college or university to: trustees, alumni, parents of students and alumni, the college community, industry and the professions. With each of these groups a college has some contacts; with others it has multiple contacts. It is bound to some by inescapable obligations, to others by suc-

cessful fiduciary relations, to others by the hope of benefactions to come.

It is the administrator's task to interpret his institution appropriately to each and all of these groups. The word "administrator" is used in the generic sense to cover whatever group of personnel, large or small, assumes the responsibility for presenting the institution to its "public." The degree to which he relates "good teaching" with his public relations program depends, in the final analysis, on the depth of his understanding and appreciation of liberal education. He will not find this point emphasized in the books on public relations which are pouring out of the publishing houses of our nation. The authors of these treatises address themselves to many aspects of this complex topic. There are specialized manuals on problems of college finance, or on alumni organization, or on techniques in fund-raising campaigns. There are many primers of glittering generalities in which altruistic authors set up the perfect formula for public relations. The chief executive, faultlessly groomed, sits in a functionally appointed office. He is alert and patient and full of bright and hopeful thoughts. His receptionist, his happy accomplice, is hard by. She sifts out telephone calls and gets him on and off the wire with precision-timing. She is expert in detecting the generous donor and the garrulous complainant and has developed methods for the suitable disposal of each. Together she and the president, or chancellor, or provost achieve financial triumphs in the Early American Fashion. The college or university enters on an expansion program the like of which the institution has never known. Appropriately one of the buildings, the Television and Radio Station, or, perhaps, the Atomic Energy Laboratory, brings down to posterity the name of the executive whose expertness in public relations achieved these marvels.

This rather hasty sketch of the recommended technique is not meant to disparage authors of treatises on public relations. It is just meant to point up to ourselves the overstress which some writers put upon fund-raising as the sole critique of public relations. We educators and administrators do not need to consider ourselves as so many eager and uneasy Horatio Algiers waiting for the moment to rise to fame and wealth. Love and job-respon-

sibility propel us to work for the total success of our respective institutions. Even before the ink has dried on the script of his inaugural address, or before he has met the board of trustees, or has been welcomed by the townsfolk or city-fathers, an administrator knows that the income from tuition and fees falls short of the minimum budget which will safely cover essential annual running expenses. The trustees and townsfolk know this grim fact also, this open secret which administrators of colleges have confided to editors of national newspapers and periodicals these many years.

The problem is real, even if it is neither novel nor unexpected. An increment to the institution's annual income must be found if faculty and students are to work together with good results. The administrator who sets out to accumulate this needed annual increment will do so most optimistically and efficiently, if he thinks hard and long of education as a process in which Mark Hopkins is at one end of the log and the student at the other. If both these characters and their relationship to one another become deeply meaningful to him, he will take something with him as he approaches his "public" which will be convincing because it is a spiritual reality powerful though invisible.

This sounds like a fine piece of rhetoric, a purple passage meant to cover the present speaker's ignorance of the topic and total lack of statistical data. But before either of these assumptions can be proved, let us go on rapidly to consider for a few moments the imponderable and important effects of good teaching. These cannot be clocked or measured in the usual way. But if we look into the past or into the present we can realize the power and drive and humanistically happy results of good teaching.

The Areopagus of Athens was wind-blown in autumn, winter and spring, and sun-baked in summer. It lacked conventional buildings for suitable accommodation of its scholars. Yet when Aristotle walked there and taught there, pupils crowded its paths and porticos. In fact, Aristotle still teaches today through his lecture-notes (now called texts), which have been edited and re-edited by scholars down the ages and which are in the hands of students in any institution of the world where philosophy and political science are in honor. Some of his pupils also made

famous texts or discourses on their own. Now, taking a leap down the centuries, we see that Irnerius of Padua drew associates and students in such throngs to Bologna that its university became, almost overnight, the rival of hitherto more famous and better established 12th century universities. Irnerius also teaches today through his treatises which are used as textbooks by students in any Schools of Law where Roman Law is a subject-field.

Good teachers drew throngs of students to Medieval Paris. The banks of the Seine can be as cold in winter as the banks of the Ohio in January. Yet when Abelard and Aquinas began their lectures at six-thirty a.m., the great unheated halls were filled with eager scholars. Even with the lack of ready or rapid means of communication, the word got round in 13th and 14th century Europe where the best could be had. Duns Scotus and Roger Bacon shed lustre on their own Oxford, as well as on the Franciscan Friars. In fact Duns Scotus became one of the Exchange or Traveling Professors who was surrounded by mobs of eager disciples in the Universities of Paris and Cologne to which he journeyed many times.

The effects of good teaching are just as potent and recognizable today. The late Professor William Lyons Phelps drew thousands to enthusiasm for manliness, for English letters and for Yale. Through the pages of Professor Mary Ellen Chase's "Goodly Fellowship" one has a sense of sunshine and serenity and of an invigorating intellectual influence which she shared with her students at the University of Minnesota, and the College of St. Catherine, and with generations of students at Smith College. Princeton, Williams and Harvard men who worked under Professor Bliss Perry were, we can assume, as glad to learn as he was to teach. The lives of thousands of children have been enlightened and enriched through the skilled remedial teaching of the teachers trained under the late Professor Thomas Shields of the Catholic University. Teachers of much experience or of no experience worked eagerly under the direction of this priest who taught himself to read at the age of seventeen, and who graduated from grammar school some two years later. It was his life's joy to bring others out of the darkness in which he had lived in his childhood. Dom Verner Moore's work in the field of psychology

drew students from many countries to the Catholic University. (It is a happy ending to know that this tireless worker is now a member of the Carthusian Order in Spain. His friends and disciples successfully foiled his plans many times. But he finally asserted his right to retire at the statutory retirement age and carried out his enthusiastically laid plans for a life of prayer and silence.) Again to return to the written record for a last illustration. Insight and gallic wit and masterly marshalling of facts lift Professor Barzun's "Teacher in America" into universal significance. He faces squarely the problems of teaching and of learning. Yet despite this published manifesto of his demanding procedures, Columbia students crowd into his courses to have the stimulating experience of working under his expert direction.

Each one here has, within his written or unwritten memoirs, recollections of teachers who have contributed to his cultural and spiritual enrichment. We have known a Mr. Chips or two. We have also known the brilliant driving professor who opened vistas to us which gave us the enthusiasm to master a discipline or push on into a subject field. It would be exhilarating to present a forum or symposium of reminiscence in which we could pay tribute to the great teachers who have profoundly influenced our several lives. We do, I know, cherish their memories in the institutions where they taught. We know that the present cultural and professional and academic entity of our colleges or universities is in large part the work of these professors.

We can then say, in conclusion, that good teaching pays good dividends. This conclusion carries certain consequences. We shall remember not only the men of former days, but the faculty who are today contributing their dedicated educational services on our respective campuses. Recognition of their work and worth will be expressed in tangible ways, in salary scale, in congenial working conditions, in encouragement of their scholarly projects—all of this within the limits of the resources of the institutions. (College administrators are no richer than Santa Claus!) The return from the investment in the welfare of the faculty will be substantial. Security and friendly contentment will free these men to give of their best. They become the institution's first-line committee on public relations. Their work with the students establishes a second committee who serve the institu-

tion by interpreting it both consciously and unconsciously to the off-campus public. The trustees, alumni, and parents quickly become aware of the vitality of the liberal arts program which a liberal and happy faculty are presenting to their students. These friendly observers rejoice in seeing the pattern of the "magnanimous man" being realized in some measure in the graduates of the institution. They are glad to see the happy results which come about by the operation of this program which disposes students to live "the excellent life" of self-development and self-perfecting which Aristotle depicts so admirably in the *Ethics* and the *Politics*, and which he insists is the right of every citizen.

This training also assists the students in seizing social relationships and thus disposes them to be useful and contributing citizens, as well as informed citizens. This sort of dependable adult, who has some intellectual interests, can think for himself and work out problems, makes an impact on the community which is more powerful than even a year-round series of excellently prepared educational news releases. Leaders in industry and in the professions quickly become aware of his presence and, through him, become interested in and grateful to the institution from which he graduated. Government also looks for this type of recruit who is worth training for many types of public service. Through the effects of good teaching a college is thus put into good relations with its off-campus public. Their interest and support follow naturally. Only Professor Einstein or the president of a pyramid club could compute the final sum-total of the influence of strong teaching and well-taught students in winning friends for the college.

This full support of the educational aims of the institutions will not relieve the administrators of financial responsibility. The rusted metal leaders on the classroom building will still have to be repaired at heavy cost; the roof of the field-house will have to be replaced, if a too buoyant tornado lifts a corner or two. Science professors must have adequate equipment, if they are to do a thorough teaching job. Students still, like the proverbial donkey, eat their weight or their ton of hay daily. But the administrator can address himself with good cheer to the finding of funds, if he is happy in the happiness of his faculty-student

group. Do not think for a moment that because of certain allusions earlier in this paper to the "primers of glittering generalities" on public relations that the administrator should eschew or deprecate modern techniques. Rather he should make full use of the excellent procedures in fund-raising which our century has brought forth. He should labor with zest to get ample means for the support and development of his college. But in doing this he will never mistake the means for the end, nor the wood for the trees. He will be an energetic, efficient, but also a "magnanimous man."

THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF GREAT TEACHING

JOHN W. DAVIS

PRESIDENT, WEST VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE

THE much-loved William Lyon Phelps said, "In my mind, teaching is not merely a life work, a profession, an occupation, a struggle; it is a passion. I love to teach. I love to teach as a painter loves to paint, as a musician loves to play, as a singer loves to sing, as a strong man rejoices to run a race. Teaching is an art. . . ." It is a mission which is related to the meaning and purposes of living. At the University of Chicago, Robert Andrews Millikan linked wisdom and prophesy in his lectures to students on science and the new civilization. His pronouncements on protons, photons, neutrons and cosmic rays have become the daily counterparts of living. John Hope at Morehouse College like Andrews of Brown University, whom he loved, used philosophy to establish for young men a moral and intellectual framework for their responsibilities in citizenship.

Through administration and organization William R. Harper at Chicago used young teachers as progressive and steadfast pathfinders in the search for truth. For many years to come the influence of true teaching will be reflected in the work of Coffman of Minnesota, Wright of Lincoln in Pennsylvania, Booker T. Washington and George W. Carver of Tuskegee, W. O. Thompson of Ohio State University, Elliot of Harvard, William James, John Dewey and many others. "There is power in true teaching. Nearly 2000 years ago, when the whole world was still barbarous beyond our conception, the greatest Teacher showed faith in the triumph of right in human society by teaching a handful of men in Judea to believe that a different sort of world was possible—one in which truth and love and justice should reign." (Charles A. Ellwood) It is a rewarding experience for any of us to recall the influence of some great teacher upon our lives.

Americans generally have shown great capacity for learning and also some difficulty for "unlearning." This is not due entirely to classroom teachers or teaching and neither has it come solely through the channels of organized education. We can safely say that great teaching on the part of thousands of de-

voted teachers has contributed to the success of the United States of America. Persons who are rich and poor, men and women of high and low estate, folk of the parlors and the street corners, peoples of various races and nationalities and religious creeds but Americans all, believe that this country is the greatest country on the earth, that this is the richest country in the world, the most productive nation with the highest standard of living, and they believe that our American way of life is based upon the soundest governmental concept and ideology which the mind of man has ever conceived. Democracy for these everyday Americans is the political expression of their Christianity.

There is opportunity for rejoicing among our grass-root citizens over the steady increase in the number of church memberships as announced from year to year. We tell the world about the huge enrolment of our public, private, denominational and church schools, colleges and universities. We boast of our highly developed sports programs and sportsmanship. We would not exchange our many freedoms for those in any other country in the world. We are a people of the greatest amount of "know-how." The wonders and the miracles of our cities attract not only the rural and small-town folk of our own country but also peoples from the far-away nations of the world. We have food, wide-open spaces, scientific knowledge, a population that is growing, culture, libraries, unlimited possibilities for intellectual, moral, economic and spiritual growth. Then, too, we have the strongest military defense of any nation on earth and we have never tasted defeat in any war in which this country has participated. Surely, this is God's country. This is the way our people feel. A grand job of teaching has been instrumental in achieving this enthusiastic expression of belief, patriotism and loyalty on the part of the people of our great country.

The American people believe in the future of this country. The successes of past years and a cold but realistic appraisal of our present situation at home and abroad support the prospect of widening unselfishly our economic frontiers and extending the boundaries of knowledge. In the immediate future President Truman thinks that it is possible to:

1. Increase our annual production from \$259,000,000,000 to \$300,000,000,000.

2. Increase employment from 58,700,000 to 64,000,000.
3. Increase consumer income by \$1000 per family.
4. Add \$45,000,000 to all consumer buying.
5. Provide three to six billion dollars for business investment.

In these estimates the President has just presented to Congress and to us an economic outlook for the on-going America as he envisions it. Reports from other sources indicate that (1) business is soon to be better than ever, (2) incomes will be highest on record, (3) jobs more plentiful and (4) retail trade will soon show vast improvement. All of this is a part of one picture. This is the America for which men will gladly die.

The lessons on dying for America have been well learned while the techniques and principles which emphasize living for America have not been sufficiently stressed. This deficiency is next on the agenda of great teaching. It is not always easy to popularize the necessity of living adventurously for a cause. The warnings of history mean very little to people who constantly see about them evidences of progress and success. In such a setting subtle and long-distance but oncoming dangers are minimized. The present war, to some, is "cold" and only "hot" wars matter. Russia is thousands of miles away and what can she do to us anyway. Besides, our material possessions, our dollars and our national strength are sufficient for our present and future needs. It is futile to remind persons of this frame of reference that cultures and nations have declined and fallen when—

- (1) great cities have arisen in which life became artificial;
- (2) there developed a dictatorship of money;
- (3) men became slaves of machines and the industrial systems;
- (4) imperialism took on a firm hold;
- (5) the population became sterile and race suicide resulted, and when
- (6) skepticism developed in the realm of thought.

For the moment, we may take advantage of our youth as a nation in offsetting such elements of decadence as we seek to employ great teaching in three other areas of major concern. They are: Human relations, Democracy and Peace. Charles Sumner said on one occasion, "Let Massachusetts keep true . . . more than loss of forts, arsenals, or the national capital, *I fear the loss of our principles.*" Our government was founded on principles.

Thirty specific complaints against the British Crown form the long train of abuses listed in the Declaration of Independence which was unanimously adopted on July 4, 1776 at Philadelphia. The abuses represented limitations on freedom—individual liberty and on the civil and elemental rights of human beings. To secure these rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness our thirteen original colonies broke away from the British Commonwealth to become free and independent states. Individual liberty and freedom have from the beginning been the cornerstone of our republican form of government. The Constitution of the United States supports these basic principles which safeguard the interests of the rich and powerful and the poor and downtrodden. Upon these rests the strength of this nation. Thaddeus Stevens disposed of the lot which he had owned in a pretentious cemetery and purchased one in a cemetery whose gates were open to all and then wrote the words which later were inscribed upon his gravemarker:

I repose in this quiet and secluded spot not from any natural preference for solitude but finding other cemeteries limited by charter rules as to race, I have chosen this that I might illustrate in death the principles which I advocated through a long life—equality of man before his Creator.

Men have fought and died for the principles upon which our government was formed and some men even after death have continued to speak eloquently for them.

One of the weaknesses of modern education is the failure of social sciences to produce helpful attitudes, social mindedness and a sense of social responsibility which are so important in right human relationships. With the tools at hand it is easier to make atom bombs than it is to make a superior citizen. The teaching of values has not been realized and as a result difficulties in the area of human relationships run counter with the basic principles inherent in our governmental structure. Can great teaching cause us to go in the direction which is pointed out in the basic principles of our government?

Elmo Roper says pointedly, "Today, democracy as we know it is on trial throughout the world." President Truman said recently, "Today the democratic way of life is being challenged all over the world. Democracy's answer to the challenge of totali-

tarianism is its promise of equal rights and equal opportunity for all mankind. The fulfillment of this promise is among the highest purposes of government." Mrs. Roosevelt speaking in New York City on January 3, 1950, suggested that "The best way to solve world problems was to make democracy a success in this country so that it would be respected throughout the world." Dean Melby said at our last conference on citizenship that, "Democracy is losing in its battle for the minds and hearts of men around the globe. Not because it is not good theory, but because we have allowed it to become a stereotyped ideal."

Add to these testimonies the fact that (1) an empire's end has just come about in Southeast Asia, (2) a statesman of India announced last January in conference that he was afraid of the friendship of America, (3) that appropriations for our military establishment soared to the new peacetime high of \$15,585,863,498, (4) peace after World War II is not yet a reality, (5) the European Recovery Program continues with an appropriation of \$5,430,000,000, (6) that we continue to think of atomic energy in terms of its destructive rather than its constructive potentialities.

These considerations demand strong men who are willing to live for American democracy—men who will broaden their scope of performance in making a workable pattern of democracy—men who will combat the forces that divide and disrupt the American people and assist the forces which are seeking to unite our people and build our country. This is one of the unfinished tasks of great teaching.

The Negro has long been the weakest link in the American domestic chain. As odd as it may seem, the strength of American democracy among the great nations of the world is not any stronger than the consideration which our country now accords its Negro people. The Negro at home is now good copy while abroad he serves as the test of the sincerity and faith of America in its own democratic form of government. It is perhaps encouraging that we know better than we do and that our intellectual and moral standards are better than our conduct but Russia does not record such to our credit. We know what to do, we know what is right, we understand our creed but seem to be unable to put into practice our professions of faith. We know that second-class citizenship as applied to Negroes is morally and po-

litically wrong, that racial segregation and discrimination are cancers which are eating away the life of America, that all racially segregated schools and colleges are inferior and should be discontinued, that the racial doctrine of *separate but equal* has always been and will always be morally weakening to democracy, that programs of regional education which include tenets of racial segregation are not in line with principles upon which this nation was founded. The present successful attacks being made upon these wrongs are designed to save this country and to continue it as the moral leader among the great nations of the world. Fair employment practices are now a part of the legal machinery of eight states and nineteen other states are considering such legislation. Civil rights are basic in responsible citizenship. The fair-minded people of our country want such rights and opportunities for all Americans. The elimination of racial discrimination and segregation in American life is necessary if this country is to direct, if not control, the course of world history in the second half of the twentieth century. A few strongly prejudiced people must not be allowed to turn the American dream into a nightmare of deadly wars for the people of this country and the world.

The road to peace in the world, to the solution of world problems, to the growing strength and maturity of this nation, is to be found in the unity and strength of our people and in the efficient working of American democracy. This is the answer to the totalitarianism of Russia. It will be our unity and strength, our triumphant democracy, our prosperity based upon first-class citizenship for all men of all colors and creeds that will cause the evil plans of the Kremlin to fail. This will represent the end of Russia as a slave state and once she turns away from planning for world conquest and begins to plan a better life for her people, we can all get on to the inspiring job of winning the peace. The atomic age will then be the golden age of which men have dreamed for centuries. This is the urgent call for great teaching.

THE OVERPLUS OF GOOD TEACHING

FRANCIS P. GAINES

PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

EXCELLENTLY and justly my colleagues on this program have borne testimony to the supremacy of the teacher. There is no substitute for him. Experiment as we may with curricula and the approaches to curricula—electives or requirements, great books or no books, honors courses or lecture periods, periphery of the comprehensive or the daily quiz—the teacher is central. There is no progress for the pilgrim on the path of learning except by way of the interpreter's house.

Some years ago, Mr. H. G. Wells, in a moment of prophetic whimsey, predicted that shortly our huge educational plants would stand idle and empty, museums of mistaken educational ideas, monuments to pedagogical futility; radio and televisions and the other gadgets of science would be the media of instruction. But Mr. Wells overlooked the indispensable contribution and influence of the teacher. Isaiah knew better when at a period of his people's despair he offered the adequate promise: "Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, nevertheless thy teachers shall not be removed—."

What characteristics exalt that influence and that contribution into the overplus of teaching? How shall we define the margin, vague in outline but clearly recognizable, that separates distinction from mere competence?

Routine credentials of satisfactoriness—and I think now of the undergraduate level—are revealed to us by our administrative experience. We learn finally how to read the letter of recommendation, what questions to phrase in that interview with a prospective teacher. We demand character, of course, a fitness to live in the academic community, or in any community, and a fineness if haply some youth should elect that teacher for the pattern of his own aspiration. We expect scholarship, not merely in terms of a fixed period or program of preparation, but a scholarship that is alive, that is a continuing fruitfulness rather than scanty erosion from deposits of petrified fact in years long past.

We hope for uncommon power of exposition, resourceful and illuminating, which gives to the presentation of material cogency and charm. We desire that authority of person which enables the teacher to command instinctively a classroom situation with dignity.

Yet all these characteristics might be included within the commonplaceness of our expectancy, the fairly ascertainable goals of our questing. Our new colleague could satisfy us reasonably well at all of these points and yet fail ever to take a place in that small group of the indispensable, the transcendently great teachers.

It might be possible to defend a thesis that the exalted singularity of this overplus is a result not of the teacher's brain, whether for its stored treasure or its alertness of new acquisition, but in the teacher's heart.

It is the teacher's heart, assuredly, the courageous and the clean heart, that gives forth those emanations which we might call the character of intellect, the moral qualities of mind, the unflinching integrity and the fidelity of pursuit. If honesty is the basis of all scholarship, then the impulse to honesty is in the pure heart, the devoted heart, without dirt of deception, without shadow of compromise.

It is the teacher's heart, moreover, that catches young life with the contagions of the timeless enthusiasm, the eagerness in discovering truth or beauty. It is the ever youthful heart of the teacher that sustains the "first fine careless rapture" in exploration and in pronouncement of the manifold riches of learning. It is the heart of which time and circumstance can take no toll, the heart of

"even the gray spirit, yearning in desire,
To follow knowledge, like a sinking star,
Beyond the utmost bound of human thought."

Not by the light thrown on some daily lesson or some soon forgotten chapter, but by a spark struck from his own flaming fervor of his heart, the teacher irradiates forever a youthful soul.

It is hardly necessary to say that in the precincts of the heart reside that unanalyzable but exquisite quality of reverence for truth or beauty—and Mr. Keats believes that they are the same.

From mathematics to aesthetics—and the jump is not so long as one might think—it is always to be remembered that truth is the highest commodity of the human value, that the esteem for truth is the soul's richest endowment, that truth makes us not only confident but also—this we have on the highest authority—it and it alone can make us free.

There is another reverence that lives in the heart, only in the heart. It is a holy respect for every personality in a given group, a respect so compulsive that the teacher becomes enormously concerned over every individual response. If there be one type of teacher that I should avoid (as Jacob lamenting the temperament of his boy, Simeon, "O my soul, come not thou into his counsels!"), that type is the teacher—and I care not how great his display of credits and degrees—who says, in effect, "Well, I dish it out and they can take it or leave it." The final test of a great teacher, it seems to me, can be stated thus simply: "Does he create in every student, varying as the song of awakening for different souls may be, a real desire to learn?" Herein is the final challenge to ingenuity and to patience, to resourcefulness and to poise; but the challenge is the ultimate measure of the nobler efficacy.

It might become a mandate of the teacher's life to call forth this empowered response from the reluctant (any teacher can provide instruction for those already deeply interested) if the teacher remembers humbly but proudly how great is his privilege to hold in custody for a little while the potential of a life, the promise of that immeasurable power which is human personality.

One of the mysterious verses of the Bible suggests to me the final phase of reverence that must be ever in the teacher's heart. It was Jesus who spoke thus mystically of the little ones—may we say the youthful ones, the yet undeveloped ones: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father—."

That verse conveys a celestial wealth of divine ambiguity which I should not undertake to translate into my own lame and limping language. But I have a sense of a corollary that I deem trustworthy. Given for a season this trusteeship of the ones whose future greatness I can help determine, I, too, should continually try to look upon the face of God.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

CLOYD H. MARVIN

PRESIDENT, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

COLLEGES and universities cannot function as trusted, free institutions of higher learning unless their faculties and the administrations representing them are kept from interference by standardizing organizations. Recognizing this principle, you have asked me to discuss with you your most recent organization, now being set up to keep for you that which is of value in accrediting, and to help you rid yourselves of the abuses that now exist in the objectives and procedures of standardizing groups,—that organization is the National Commission on Accrediting.

A recent survey of the attitude of our people toward higher education made by one of the foremost magazines of our day, among other findings, conclusively affirmed belief in the place of our colleges and universities. Because of this profound belief, our institutions of higher learning have grown in numbers drawn from all classes in our nation, in size and in resources. They are now better equipped in intellectual leadership, better fitted in equipment and better provided with effective organization for the task that our democratic state expects of them. They are alive with a vitality that educates minds to meet the difficulties and respond to the opportunities of our day. They create knowledge. Their discoveries and their thinking penetrate every activity in which men are engaged.

Our colleges and universities have not only a unique opportunity, but a definite responsibility to meet. My assignment compels me to lay emphasis upon the responsibility of our institutions. Our democratic thinking is being reordered in a time of domestic uncertainty that has an international backdrop depicting unique suspicion, incredulous maneuvering and variant social and political pronouncements. Uncertainty, fear, cupidity, misunderstanding and hate seem to be in the ascendancy. As a result, the peoples of the world emphasize security. From a domestic standpoint the picture is little different. It seems at times that the people of this nation have forgotten the bases of the Declara-

tion of Independence, and the significance of the Bill of Rights, and would trade basic freedom and spiritual concepts for material security; that we, not wanting to be annoyed with finding the answers to our multifarious and difficult problems in our democratic way of doing things, would accept a pattern of social controls. We know that such a pattern would circumscribe our thinking, limit our activity and destroy our very soul. We do not want guild patterns to control us.

Our colleges and universities are at the very center of our way of life. They are for the most part free, and that they may educate men and women to lead in our way of life, we want them to remain free. When our colleges and universities were young, great anxiety prevailed over their control through specialized gifts from individuals or corporations. State and federal grants as well as grants from individuals and corporations were often suspect. But the boards and the faculties of our institutions working together in almost every instance have accepted such funds on such a basis that the classrooms and laboratories could remain free.

Today, we are going through the throes of being beset by well-meaning community pressures, wherein local prides, such as in athletics, specialized services and the like, tend to make inroads on academic freedom. We are being interfered with by political pressures in the form of oaths of fidelity and made weary by the infiltration of propaganda of minority groups. These, too, will be met wisely in due course of time. But it is not of these interferences with the freedom of colleges and universities that we at this moment are interested. We are to think about an interfering system, partially good, mostly bad, which we have had a hand in developing, that is hurting the freedom of our classrooms and laboratories, the plans of standardization which we, euphoniously and sometimes pridefully, call "accrediting."

The study of accrediting begins. That accrediting brings problems to our colleges and universities is admitted. Early this century the system was born and it soon became apparent that it was not an unmixed blessing. In 1923, the National Association of State Universities seriously began to deal with the problem. It studied a total of 27 accrediting agencies in the field. As a result of this study, two suggestions were made: (a) that agencies

should limit their activities to making suggestions, and the accumulation of supporting data; (b) that an educational council be established to exercise and react to these suggestions. These recommendations resulted in the publication in 1926 of a list of standardizing agencies, with which the colleges and universities could cooperate.

In 1927, Dr. F. J. Kelly read his paper, "The Influence of Standardizing Agencies," in which he listed three chief dangers in standardization. They are:

1. Standardization endangers public confidence in a profession by limiting the number entering the profession, thereby increasing fees for professional services. (This referred to guild practices.)

2. Standardized schools and departments get a disproportionate amount of funds. (This meant the interference in faculty controls by means of distribution of funds.)

3. Agencies demand a uniformity of educational practice impeding progress. (We were creating holding organizations to control us.)

In 1938, the National Association of State Universities took action on the matter. After full discussion the motion was put.

President Bizzell: "President Hulliher has made a motion and Chancellor Hunter seconded it that the Association provide for a Standing Committee on Accrediting Agencies."

The motion was carried, and further

"It was moved and seconded that the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities and the Association of American Universities be asked to cooperate with this committee." The motion was carried.

In the same year the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities took up the problem and adopted recommendations which joined them with the State Universities in a study of the matter.

The Committee resulting, reported and listed six outstanding evils which grew out of the efforts of standardizing agencies. They were:

1. There are too many such agencies, by this time, 35 to 40.
2. Their activities are destroying institutional rights and freedoms. They are assuming the power of governing boards.

3. Costs levied by agencies for investigation are becoming excessive.

4. There is too much duplication of accreditation,—national, regional, departmental.

5. Their standards are quantitative and superficial.

6. Outside groups dominate and refuse participation of educational groups in accreditation.

You will note that because of time, I am summarizing and not describing humorous details, tragic instances and pitiable examples of encroachment that could be mentioned without number.

Recognizing the acuteness of the problems involved, in October of 1939, the American Council on Education published a pamphlet called, "Coordination of Accrediting Activities." This was a summary of proceedings of a Conference that the American Council had called on accrediting. This Conference was attended by the representatives of accrediting associations and others. It was held in Washington in April of 1939. The introduction to this report points out, "One cause for the growing concern about the activities of these bodies (accrediting groups) had been their rapid multiplication and the widening scope of their work. Educational institutions composed of numbers of schools or divisions are finding the task of supplying information requested by these agencies, and subjecting themselves to their frequent inspection, irritatingly burdensome; and the mounting costs of this procedure in both time and money, are becoming prohibitive."

"Trustees, administrative officers, and faculty members have begun to wonder who really controls our educational institutions. They see a final determination of educational policy, consciously or unconsciously being assumed by accrediting agencies, and they are exercised by what they consider a usurpation of their own legal and proper responsibilities."

In the same year, Dr. George F. Zook read a paper before the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, entitled, "Who Should Control Our Institutions of Higher Education?" A typical sentence from his paper is, "Once more the individual institutions are asking for freedom—this time from the requirements of a variety of associations."

In 1939, President Samuel P. Capen delivered an address

styled, "Seven Devils in Exchange for One." In this address he pointed out, "One of the strongest motives behind the standardizing movement was the desire of honest craftsmen and scholars to put an end to dishonesty and to educational malpractice. Standardizing bodies were, in effect, vigilance committees which, in the interest of public order and at great inconvenience to the members, made and enforced laws where there was no law."

President Capen continued, "the second reason is akin to the first. After the Council on Medical Education had shown how medical education could be improved by the combination of drastic classification and widespread publicity, the earnest and high-minded members of the professions, including teachers in professional schools, sought only to follow the example to improve the training for their callings likewise. The accrediting procedures more recently adopted by the professional associations and the associations of professional schools have been devised primarily with this end in view.

"But there has appeared another motive for standardizing activities, less admirable than the two just mentioned. As yet it has not been very prominent in the standardizing movement. I suspect, however, that we shall see more evidence of it in the near future. I mean the protective motive. Standardizing or accrediting, if the accrediting bodies so decide, can be used to restrict entry into a profession. By limiting the enrolment in professional schools, the number of professional practitioners can be regulated with almost absolute precision. The accrediting of medical schools has already been extended to effect a limitation of the number of practitioners. The accrediting bodies deal with certain other types of professional schools and are now considering the desirability of using their machinery to accomplish similar results. This practice is called either 'the establishment of a quota' or 'the creation of a private monopoly.'"

About the time that President Capen was making his address, President John J. Tigert, who now headed the special committee of the two associations, made the statement, "More criticisms (against accrediting agencies) are emanating from strong institutions with large material and personal resources, where the better quality of work presumably is being done, than from institutions whose facilities are more meager and where more natu-

rally there might arise a question as to the validity of their program."

In 1940, the Joint Committee on Accrediting included the Land-Grant groups, the State Universities, and the Association of American Universities.

The same year the Association of Urban Universities accepted an invitation to join in the work of the Joint Committee on Accrediting, and appointed a representative to meet with them. The next step was to invite the Association of American Colleges to join the Committee. At the Joint Committee meeting one college president made the statement, "I feel that college administration has increasingly become just a local representative for accrediting associations."

Another representative in discussing the standardizing bodies said, "If we count agencies of the Federal Government, state agencies for certification and licensure, national certifying and examining boards, associations of colleges and professional schools, associations of specialists in various subjects, local organizations for educational uplift or for group protection, and organizations that are essentially clubs professing an educational interest, there are easily a couple of hundred standardizing bodies issuing directions and commands to American colleges and universities."

Again, in 1941 the American Council on Education called a conference and published the results of the conference in a pamphlet called, "Cooperation in Accrediting Procedures."

The Joint Committee met in Chicago in April of 1946, and President Tigert, retiring, had turned the chairmanship of the Joint Committee over to Chancellor Gustavson. The discussion brought out the need for a complete study of the problems involved and a firmer organization.

To further complicate the problem and with but little warning, the Association of American Universities, under date of November sixth (1948), sent out the following notice:

"I am writing to inform you that the Association of American Universities has terminated its work in the field of accreditation. This action was taken after rather extensive study of the problem. . . ."

In December of 1948, a meeting on accrediting was held at

The George Washington University, in which many collegiate leaders who were especially interested in the problem of standardization and accrediting participated. It was the consensus of this meeting that accrediting brought many problems to the colleges and universities.

It was brought out at this meeting that certain of the sectional accrediting groups were trying to develop means of surveying complex institutions of higher education. Heretofore, they had been primarily interested in the liberal arts offerings. This undertaking might add to the confusion already existing unless some plan is worked out to correlate these activities with the regular established professional accrediting groups.

Then on May 3rd, 1949, pursuant to a call of Chairman Reuben G. Gustavson, the Joint Committee on Accrediting met. There were representatives of the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, present.

In opening the meeting, the Chairman of the Committee said, in part:

"The rapid growth and the multifarious activities of standardizing agencies present a number of problems for the colleges and universities. The earlier work of the pioneer accrediting agencies made noteworthy contributions to the improvements of certain departments of instruction in institutions of higher learning. The development of standards for professional schools, notably medicine and law, aided university authorities in maintaining improved programs, assisted in the elimination of inadequate schools, and helped reduce the fierce competition among institutions when legal and other controls were lacking. Gradually the fiercely competing and weak schools for professional training were weeded out, forced to consolidate, or to develop and maintain improved programs. In many instances, professional schools became integral units in university centers or found an appropriate permanent function as a separate institution. The constructive nature of these early contributions on the part of professional accrediting organizations is recognized by all concerned.

"I received from President Tigert a 'five-foot shelf' of cor-

respondence dealing with accrediting which had accumulated over the years. I have examined this material carefully. One cannot look through this correspondence without being impressed with the fact that a great many institutions, both public and private, large and small, are dissatisfied with the work of accrediting agencies. Again and again one finds the evils recited and a hope expressed that some relief can be found.

"At a meeting of our Committee held in Chicago about a year ago, it was decided to recommend a moratorium in the field of accreditation until the Committee had an opportunity to find its bearings and to work out some basic principles which should govern the actions of the Joint Committee on Accrediting.

"A review of our problem as it exists today shows that the evils growing out of the work of accrediting agencies are increasing. Their influence on the work and development of our educational institutions is becoming more significant every year that goes by. It is very evident that the basic principle of the union of responsibility and authority in college administration is being threatened. The committee feels that since the problem is nationwide and since it involves the work of small colleges as well as large universities, a union of all forces is necessary to work out basic principles and to attack the problem.

"It is for this reason that at the last meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, the Joint Committee recommended that a committee of ten be formed with two representatives from each of the following organizations to study the problem: The Association of American Universities, The Association of American Colleges, The National Association of State Universities, the Association of Urban Universities, and The Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

"After a full discussion of the problems involved, the Committee turned to a discussion of the organization of the Commission and it was moved that a permanent National Commission on Accrediting be established by expanding the present National Joint Committee to thirty members, five members from each group. This is to be done with the approval of the five constituent organizations.

"It was further decided that ultimately the work of this permanent Commission would be referred at the appropriate time to

the member colleges and universities for information and direction. It was decided that the functions of the new Commission would be:

1. To devise a statement of accrediting principles.
2. To study, analyze and report upon present practices and procedures of existing and proposed accrediting agencies, and to make recommendations to member institutions concerning relationships with accrediting agencies.
3. To formulate methods which will produce agreement between the practices of accrediting agencies, and the approved principles of accrediting formulated by the National Commission.
4. To set up a permanent secretariat with a budget of approximately \$30,000, which shall be supported by dues, to be assessed in proportion to enrolment.
5. Other than in the case of those associated with determining the validity of appeals from the actions of accrediting agencies, the Commission would not assume accrediting functions with respect to individual colleges and universities.

The above functions were approved unanimously."

The Commission has at this time been approved by all the organizations above mentioned and the representatives have been named with the exception of the Association of American Universities. Its nominees are expected daily. A meeting of the Commission is being arranged at an early date.

When your Commission meets in the next few weeks, it will have to draw up a statement of objectives, formulate by-laws, arrange for setting up organization and making approaches to the study of accrediting bodies. Among the questions which will come up for decision are the following.

Universities and colleges have aided in the maintenance of certain professional standardizing groups, such as the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the Association of American Law Schools. These organizations have played very close to the professional (non-educational) organizations, so as to be dominated by the professional organizations; in some instances to the point of permitting themselves to become, to all intents and purposes, agents of the professional organizations they represent rather than the higher education system of which they are a part. Thus they are a part of "the guild," and center their attention

on economic and professional control (limiting of registration, high costs of education, due to the insistence upon details of classroom procedure that should be in the hands of the faculties rather than service to the greatest possible number of people of the society that supports them).

The problem—should higher education permit educational organizations, which it supports and to which it has looked for guidance, to be dominated by or have any direct connection with professional organizations that are set up for “professional improvement,” technical and economic?

There is a trend, as exemplified by the American Chemical Society, for professional organizations to set up their own standardizing agencies that treat with departments of liberal arts colleges as well as “colleges of chemistry.”

The question—do American colleges and universities want to sacrifice cultural objectives and methods for professional aims in our colleges, under the penalty of having undergraduate students barred because of non-accrediting?

Again, do colleges and universities want to “take orders” from any professional organization?

The membership fees in standardizing agencies and inspection assessments have been growing at a rapid rate, until the cost to higher education is out of all proportion to the good offered to our universities and colleges.

Problem—should the Commission review all such membership fees and inspection assessments with the idea of reducing them or eliminating them entirely?

Questionnaires, a substitute for intelligent observation, have been the instruments used to try to get more and more details about the educational processes of institutions of higher learning. Not only are inquiries being made about the educational field, but universities and colleges are requested to give vital figures on every phase of their operation. The questionnaires are exhaustive and exhausting, and without an intimate knowledge of the educational situation being surveyed, of not too much value.

Question, by what means can general information about colleges and universities be correlated and made available? Again, how can the burden of questionnaires be lessened or done away with?

Under the resolutions adopted, your National Commission on

Accrediting has the power to ask for the cooperation of established standardizing agencies in the solution of accrediting problems.

Problem—to work out the method of bringing standardizing agencies to meet educational patterns.

New standardizing groups are being organized from time to time, which will further interfere with the freedom of college and university faculties in their administration of the educational fields for which they are responsible.

It should be remembered that at the 1948 meeting of the Joint Committee, now the National Commission on Accrediting, that all the representatives of colleges and universities agreed not to enter into negotiations with any new standardizing groups, until the new group was approved.

Problem—shall the National Commission on Accrediting set up a plan whereby standardizing agencies can be recognized?

We all know that one professor with very much less in the way of equipment can enthuse and develop scholars, where another with great physical assets seems to get lost in his equipment, and cannot. Instead of depending on floor space, numbers of volumes in a library, the unit cost of instruction, etc., as the gauge by which to standardize, emphasis should be placed upon the acceptability of graduates as the means of accrediting. It has been said, "You know a tree by the fruit it bears."

Question—what means have been developed to estimate the quality of a college's graduates, and how can they be used in accrediting procedures?

In building up a protective system, professional organizations have been able to get written into federal and state statutes certain "accrediting" standards as a prerequisite for a candidate to undertake "state boards," or to meet certification standards. Here universities and colleges are definitely made use of to protect the profession, and it is often argued, the public.

Question—how to develop a study of the legal aspects of "standardizing" interference, and to effect measures to clear away undesirable legislation.

With the dropping of accrediting by the American Association of Universities, the regional associations—the New England, the

Middle States, the Southern, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, and the Western College Association—are being called upon to undertake larger service in accrediting. There is a fine cooperation being worked out between these associations, which will help them to a common understanding, yet leave them free to meet the problems of the areas they represent.

Question—how can the program of the National Commission on Accrediting be of greatest assistance to the regional accrediting associations?

As we organize this National Commission on Accrediting, it becomes our turn to ask questions of the standardizing group. We shall want to see their charters, the by-laws under which they work and the rules and regulations that govern their actions. We shall ask about objectives and practices, about their financial structures and other things. I believe every accredited institution should receive from the standardizing agency an annual report of the agency, giving its accomplishments, any changes in its rulings and a complete financial statement. We receive such statements from corporations of which we are members; we as colleges and universities make out such reports, so we should have them from those whom “we trust with our standards.”

Question—how shall we find out if we believe they are properly administered, and whether they are of value to this nation’s system of higher education? Shall we sit around a conference-table where men can understand the objectives of each other’s acts, or shall we send out a fifty-page questionnaire?

The purpose of the National Commission on Accrediting is clear. Its immediate task is to set up its by-laws and effect its organization. Its objectives can be stated only after the Commission has passed them. It will act soon.

OBSERVATIONS OF AN AMERICAN EDUCATOR IN EUROPE 1949

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

PRESIDENT, AUGUSTANA COLLEGE

LATE last spring, I sat one afternoon in the office of the head of the Religious Affairs division of the Military Government of Occupation in Germany together with Dr. Alonzo Grace, director of the division of Education and Cultural Affairs. He was planning the first international education conference to be held in Germany since the war. In the course of our conversation, Dr. Arild Olsen earnestly expressed what was in the minds of the Americans charged with the rehabilitation of German education. I had just come to Germany—three months later, after an intensive tour of German universities, I understood more clearly why there was such apprehension in the voices of the American educators. "What we most fear," was the word of this man who knew developments since the war most intimately, "is the growth of nihilism. This is the greatest danger today in the ranks of youth seeking an education."

I had read something of nihilism, but I confess it all was a little theoretical. And I had failed to see its relationship to a form of existentialism which is today a philosophy among those who despair. I was to learn that a different kind of thinking can develop amid ruins of cities and in an uprooted society from that which develops on the cloistered walks of an American campus and in the security-minded communities of our land. I can now understand why those in close touch with European conditions fear what goes on in the mind of a youth which is frustrated, despairing, cynical. We have done much to aid the physical wants of Europe, but before her vast spiritual need we stand perplexed. What is worse, I fear that the virus of her nihilism may infect our own youth. It is of the reason for my fear that I wish to speak on this occasion.

At the University of Marburg, Professor Benz gave me a small book he has written on *Nihilism in West and East*. No literature I brought back with me has left on my mind quite so deep an

impression as this booklet. An authority on relations between Europe and Russia, Benz in this volume has traced to its source the use of the word "nihilism" in the literature of the past century. I shall not here give his results in any detail. But the main outline is sufficient to disturb any educator who is interested in the future of Christian education in America.

Benz finds the first reasoned use of the word "nihilism" in the writings of a Catholic philosopher and theologian at München around 1825. This thinker, whose influence on 19th century thought was immense, warned both Catholics and Protestants of what was happening, and called on them to unite against a common foe. For to him the most ominous event of his time was the divorce between learning and religion. Remember that this was a generation before Darwin and the natural sciences were just embarking on their great career. But even then it was evident that scientists and theologians were at the parting of the ways. Baader distributed the blame evenly. While the students of nature were blind in their not seeing the revelation of God, the students of theology were blind in not including all truth in the revelation of God. The result was that religion was becoming obscurantist, and learning was turning atheistic. The greatest need of the time, Baader declared, was for the reunion of learning and religion. And to him this was no mere academic need. He was concerned about the result of the divorce in the minds of university youth. Their loss of faith could only lead to the "absolute sovereignty of man" and in a prophetic passage he describes the social consequences:

Such doctrines will surely enkindle in young minds the rebellious spirit of pride, self-exaltation and egoism, and the fruits which they bring from the academies and universities into public life can be no other than a deep-grounded hatred and contempt for all (civil and religious) institutions of society which are not characterized by this arbitrary self-determination of the individual but presuppose a determination by law and a subordination of the self, and are founded on the conviction that only *that* can have authority over man which he himself has not constituted. And since there slumbers in every human heart a seed of the lust to destroy, it will not be possible, once such doctrines of the absolute sovereignty or autonomy of man awaken this seed in the minds of at least individual youths, to prevent it from grow-

ing into the fury of destructiveness, and from identifying finally this urge to destroy with the very instinct of existence, inasmuch as such a person must destroy (hate and annihilate what exists) if only to keep alive the continuity of the feeling to exist.

From that point on, the line of development leads through Feuerbach, Marx and Nietzsche. Western nihilism proclaims that God is dead, man takes his place—the Super-man.

Benz describes, further, the peculiar character of Eastern or Russian nihilism, which he finds most clearly delineated in the pages of Dostoyevsky. But the most devastating passage in this gripping description of the development of Communist philosophy is, to my mind, a quotation from Berdyaev. "It is not by chance that the sons of the Russian priests who were trained in the seminaries played a decisive role in Russian nihilism, and that the leading journalists of the 60's, Dobroljubov and Tschernyschersky, came out of just these groups. The importance of this phenomenon was twofold: these seminarians were influenced in a religious sense by the idea of ascetic world-denial, and at the same time had the opportunity to see deeply into the inner rottenness of a professed Christianity and to experience personally its sins. They became the initiators of opposition against the spiritual leaders, the oppressive atmosphere of the ecclesiastical schools, and against the whole world of this decayed Christianity. The seminarians were captivated by the ideas of freedom inherent in the Enlightenment and gave to them a peculiarly Russian extremist form. At the same time, there awakened in these youth a yearning for social justice which they transformed under the influence of their Christian education."

In outline, the origin of nihilism is seen in the West in the parting of the ways between religion and learning, and in the East in the revolt of youth against a religion which had lost interest in social righteousness. I know that I am not the only recent visitor to Europe who begins gradually to feel that probably America is not as different from Europe as he would like to believe. The most disquieting factor is that Americans are so complacent and so satisfied with their security. Their attitude can hardly be described as "it can't happen here," because that would imply some reasoning which led to the conclusion "it

can't." Rather the word seems to be "it won't happen here"—if only because we don't want it to happen.

Yet a sober facing of fact discloses—and I speak from the point of view of a Christian—that exactly this separation of religion and learning is in an advanced stage among us. I am not now thinking of the relationship of science and theology, which is only one sector of the situation, and I emphasize that Baader's description antedated the main struggle over evolution. I refer to the general American assumption that religion is a "private" matter, of consequence only to the "private" individual who holds it. And the magnification of this standpoint is a university system that considers religion one of a thousand subjects, "elective" not only as a course but in the sense that religion may or may not be of interest to an educated man. Compare for instance Baader's words at the opening of the University of Munich in 1826 with a paragraph from the Harvard Report. One bears the title *Concerning the Freedom of the Intelligence*, the other *General Education in a Free Society*. The European analyst held that "We as laymen ought to be reminded that only through united effort of the secular learned and the clergy can we solve the greatest problem of our time—the problem of the reunion, the restoration and the consecration of learning by religion as well as the confirmation of the doctrines of religion by learning—we shall not fail in giving effective opposition both to the *nihilism* and the *obscurantism* of our time, that is both against the abuse of intelligence tending toward the destruction of religion, as also against the equally evil *inhibition of the use of intelligence* arising partly out of fear, partly out of despising of learning." A century later, in America, the Harvard analysis holds, "Sectarian-colleges have of course their solution, which was generally shared by American colleges until less than a century ago: namely, the conviction that Christianity gives meaning and ultimate unity to all parts of the curriculum, indeed to the whole life of the college. But whatever one's views, religion is not now for most colleges a practicable source of intellectual unity."

American higher education—or shall we say all American education—is not "an intellectual unity" and we but delude ourselves when we throw over it a general blanket called the "American way" or "democratic." We would be only honest if we

admitted that we have no principle of unity and that each is "on his own." This was exactly the condition of European intellectual life preceding the philosophy of Feuerbach and Nietzsche. "God is dead" in much of modern learning, and his place is taken by a variety of supermen—the only ones to take his place. In the political sphere we have arrived at the supreme sovereignty of the state in the educational sphere, the sovereignty of the learned. Authority gives place to authorities.

But from the religious standpoint, I believe we only widen the gulf when we berate the representatives of learning who eschew religion. In fact I believe the greater responsibility lies on the representatives of religion. They have too often defended a conception of religion which is too narrow, too obscurantist, too authoritarian, to enable the full powers of man to develop. That, I hold, is one lesson Christian educators can learn from Europe, including Russia. While all the sciences have been interpreted since Galileo in dynamic terms, proponents of religion have too often held to static views. There is something wrong in any interpretation of religion which does not call out all the capacities of humanity. There is something wrong about interpreters of religion whose faith in the power of the Creator cannot keep pace with the discoveries of scientists in the wonders of creation. That cathedrals of learning have taken the place of cathedrals of worship only proves that the cathedral builders have discovered more of mathematics than they have of the knowledge of God. It may even be that we have lost, rather than gained, in the learning of the truth of God. Someone said of Burroughs, the great naturalist, that he knew the garden but not the gardener. Is it not true that in our self-sufficiency we have degraded the conception of God so that we have no true vision of Him?

In Benz's work, which I have already cited, there is a remarkable quotation from Ricarda Huch's book, *Michael Bakunin and Anarchy*. In her description it is clear that the Church is responsible for the distortion. "The Almighty, placed on the throne by a victorious Church, altered his features fully, but so slowly and in accommodation to men that those for the most part never even noticed it. The great Jehovah, the All-Father, in whose hands lay blessing and curse, the eternal source of

inexhaustible creativity and doom, became a doorkeeper in Hotel Europa with the task of keeping order in a manner most comfortable for those guests best able to pay. He was a doorkeeper in rich living, so majestic that one dared not even approach him without a good tip. His sensing of the social status of each one was infallible; before his forbidding glance even the boldest of the have-nots became conscious of his own poverty as he came in with his traveling bag. Into such a porter God had gradually become transformed. He had been well cared for—therefore he was supposed to preserve the existing order. The status quo was illuminated by halos of holiness. The greatest sin, the greatest ignorance, the most obvious delusion, was to want to destroy what prevailed."

When we speak about scientists not being interested in God may it be that Christian educators have given students in the sciences a caricature of God instead of bringing them to a vision of God? The childish notions of God which many university students have found themselves discarding may not have been worthy of preservation—the tragedy is that Christian education has given so little beyond the childish stage. No more damning indictment of popular idolatry can be given than the fact that so many believe that the Church is for women and children! The highest concern of the educated man should, we believe, be with his attitude towards the Unknown. Kierkegaard and Karl Barth have done our generation a world of good in ridiculing the superstitious views we hold of religion. But it can hardly be maintained that even our church colleges have taken seriously the task of reinterpreting to modern paganism a revelation of God which has become obscured in modern learning.

Europe is digging itself out of ruins. We are acquainted somewhat with the physical debris. But a more acute observer would see the ruins of intellectual systems—philosophy, politics, economics, yes, even religion. Nihilism hovers in the background. Existentialism is in the foreground. Both are ghosts of a departed culture. What will arise out of the ruins is yet unknown, and we in America can only hope for something better for Europe.

But, as educators who are supposed to possess some insight into what is happening and some foresight as to what may happen

in our own land, I think it high time for us to see beyond budgets and building programs and enrolment figures and look to the foundations of the very culture we take for granted. If we cannot heal the breach between religion and learning we will see a Church withdrawing itself further into obscurity and obscurantism, and we will see universities producing a youth who are their own lords and who will lord it over each other until they breed revolution. The churches of Europe became identified with the preservation of what existed, so that the only possible way of change included an overthrow also of the Church. The Church had become a guarantor of certain parts of truth and certain people of the community—it had ceased to be a witness to all truth and a standard of justice for all persons. If education in America is to follow the same pattern, the results may be the same and a future observer of the ruins in Chicago and New York, Boston and Cincinnati, will wonder that Americans thought it wouldn't happen here. He may wonder, too, that in 1950 Americans feared Communism in Russia and were not aware that the peril lay not without but in their own minds and hearts. Their doubt had undermined the magnificent structure whose foundations had been laid in faith.

COMMISSION ON FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION
(under the sponsorship of the Association of
American Universities)

JOHN D. MILLETT

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ON OCTOBER 24, 1947, the Rockefeller Foundation convened a one-day conference to discuss the postwar financial position of American colleges and universities. The meeting was called because of numerous intimations to the Foundation that American colleges and universities were facing many financial difficulties after the war. A small group of college administrators sat down with representatives of the Rockefeller Foundation and of the General Education Board. The persons attending this conference were unanimous in declaring that a comprehensive investigation of the financing of higher education and research was urgently needed.

Acting upon this expression of opinion, the Rockefeller Foundation appointed an exploratory committee on financing higher education and research. The committee consisted of Dr. Paul H. Buck, Provost of Harvard University as chairman; Dean Neil H. Jacoby of the College of Business Administration of the University of California at Los Angeles; Vice President George A. Brakeley of Princeton University; Provost James P. Adams of the University of Michigan; Vice President James A. Perkins of Swarthmore College; Guy Emerson of New York and Donald Young, then President of the Social Science Research Council.

This exploratory committee held its initial meeting in New York City on December 5, 1947. Subsequently, it held a three-day meeting in Chicago from March 1-3, 1948, and a similar meeting at Princeton on June 25-27, 1948.

The report of the exploratory committee was transmitted to the Rockefeller Foundation on August 1, 1948. In the meantime, the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education had been released. The exploratory committee, which had developed out of circumstances antedating the report of the President's Commission and unconnected with it, agreed that

there was still a need for a careful study of college and university financing. The committee submitted three recommendations to the Rockefeller Foundation. The first recommendation was for a careful and comprehensive study of the financing of higher education and research. The second recommendation called for the formulation of policy recommendations for the future guidance of all agencies interested in the financing of higher education. The third recommendation proposed a public information program which would call both the research findings and the policy recommendations to the attention of the general public.

The exploratory committee proposed that these objectives be realized through the creation of an *ad hoc* commission on financing higher education and research. An executive director and staff would be responsible for the prosecution of the necessary studies. The commission itself would be responsible for the determination of basic policy recommendations. An outline of the various subjects to be studied and a proposed time schedule and budget were submitted as part of the report of the committee.

Following general consideration of these recommendations, the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation accepted the first two recommendations of the exploratory committee and appropriated \$400,000 for this purpose at a meeting in April 1949. At the same time, the Carnegie Corporation of New York joined with a participating grant of an additional \$50,000, both funds to be available for a three-year period from July 1, 1949. Because foundation funds could not be appropriated to a non-existing agency, the sponsorship of the study by the Association of American Universities was sought and obtained. A nucleus group to make up the commission was appointed by President Wriston of the Association of American Universities. In turn, the nucleus group selected additional members so that at the present time the Commission on Financing Higher Education is composed of 14 persons: chairman of the commission, Frank D. Fackenthal, formerly Acting President of Columbia University and Consultant on Educational Administration to the Carnegie Corporation; President Detlev W. Bronk of Johns Hopkins University; Provost Paul H. Buck of Harvard University; President Carter Davidson of Union College; President Lee A. DuBridge of California Institute of Technology; President Fred-

erick A. Middlebush of the University of Missouri; President J. E. Wallace Sterling of Stanford University; and President Henry M. Wriston of Brown University. These are the members of the commission who are active in university administration. The lay members of the commission are Laird Bell, Chicago attorney, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University, and member of the Board of Trustees of Carleton College; Henry L. Corbett, investment banker, Portland, Oregon; A. Crawford Greene, San Francisco attorney and member of the Board of Trustees of Mills College; General William Henry Harrison, President of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation and Henning W. Prentis, Jr., President of the Armstrong Cork Company.

The first meeting of the commission was held on July 11, 1949 at which time an executive director was appointed and arrangements made for beginning the program of studies of the commission. At the present time, the commission is meeting about every two months in two-day sessions.

As now planned, the research studies of the commission will be made under four major headings. The first of these has to do with the objectives and organization of higher education in the United States. It is not the commission's role, and certainly not the intention of the research staff, to suggest what should be the objectives of higher education in the United States. The purpose rather is to indicate the major objectives of higher education as they have developed historically and as they are presently revealed by student programs. It is equally important to analyze the organization which has developed in order to achieve these objectives. The objectives and organization of higher education indicate what higher education is undertaking to accomplish and what, accordingly, must be financed.

In the second place, studies must be made of the major social, economic and political changes which have taken place in the American environment in recent years and which have far-reaching impact upon the conduct of higher education.

In the third place, the Commission will undertake studies of the various cost elements of higher education and examine proposals for reducing some of this cost.

Finally, the most extensive studies of the commission will necessarily deal with the various means of financing higher education—endowment income, student fees, governmental appropriations and private gifts.

On the basis of these research studies and findings, the commission hopes to be able to formulate possible alternatives of future action for higher education in the United States.

It is, of course, impossible to examine in detail every individual college or university in the United States in the course of a single study. Wherever possible, existing data will be utilized in order to provide a comprehensive coverage of educational institutions. Otherwise, carefully selected institutions will be studied in detail in order to afford an indication of present trends and developments in financing higher education.

Much of the success of the enterprise must necessarily depend upon the cooperation and assistance provided by colleges and universities. To date this cooperation has been forthcoming in generous measure.

The commission has established its headquarters at 1860 Broadway, New York 23, New York.

INTERDEPENDENCE OF EDUCATION AND INDUSTRY

WALLACE F. BENNETT

CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

IT IS gratifying to realize that you recognize that there must be a vital partnership between education and industry, illustrated in this morning's fine meeting. Your consideration, in a narrow sense, will be of great service to your respective institutions. In a broad sense, they are a part of the great battle for the future of freedom in America.

As I understand it, you represent primarily the liberal arts colleges of our country. It is particularly appropriate, then, that I talk with you this afternoon because I want to discuss not only material values, but more especially spiritual values, and it is you and your predecessors who have been charged with the development of spiritual values in the students for many generations. With our emphasis on the scientific advances of this atomic age, I am afraid that too often we are inclined to worship at the feet of science without realizing that scientific progress is worth little of not accompanied by spiritual or moral values.

I am sure I don't need to remind any of the men in this room that your citizenship is the greatest political blessing on the earth today. There are few men on the earth anywhere outside of these United States who wouldn't give most anything they had for your citizenship. With all the disappointments, with all the problems, and with all the frustrations that seem to disturb us in America today, we still stand envied of all the earth, envied because of our material prosperity, envied because of our political tradition, envied because of the personal freedom and the great personal tradition of liberty and opportunity.

Many industrialists, when they talk of America, like to talk in terms of the past. You can make a very stirring speech about the wonderful history of our country, about the fact that in a little more than three hundred years we have built on this part of the American continent a great civilization and accumulated a great mass of physical wealth. It is easy to memorize statistics about bathtubs, and telephones, and automobiles, and persuade

ourselves that we are a great people. But I think we must concern ourselves infinitely more with the future, and we must be less complacent about our achievements of the past. Maybe it is just because I have reached the age when I have some sons who are on the threshold of their life in business, and I have a grandson, but I am conscious of the future more than I have ever been.

The fundamental problem that we in industry face is whether the America of the next generation will be as kind to its people as it has been to this generation. Will our children enjoy the privileges that we enjoy? Will their lives be as pleasant, as blessed, as prosperous as ours? We hope they will be better. Many of us are beginning to realize that there is a great danger that their future will not be as good. We are beginning to realize that our generation has begun to spend some of the basic inheritances that were given to us in trust. We have begun to spend them on ourselves, and so we must begin to think very seriously about the problem of our children, and of their children.

Looking back over this country's magnificent history, it seems to me that there are three forces in it so completely intertwined that it is impossible to separate them and discuss them apart from each other. So, obviously, in my attempt to do so, I am going to leave some gaps and ignore some obvious overlapping.

The first force is the force of our productive capacity. It is the material force. It has produced the physical things that make life so much easier and more pleasant for us than it was physically, at least, for our fathers and our grandfathers.

Many people like to talk about America's material greatness in terms of natural resources. I have come to realize that we have not been much more blessed from that point of view than most other parts of the earth. Our great blessing has been in the ability we have had to use these resources, and on the basis of our resources, we have built a great heritage and great capital resources of productivity.

America is great today not for what she has, but for what she can do with it, what she can produce. That's the great material wealth of America—not what we have, but what we have that can be the basis of production for the future.

So in terms of material problems, the problem that industry faces for the future is very simple. Will this productive capacity

which has been so kind to us in our generation be strengthened enough within the next generation so that it will not only produce what it can now produce, but will produce enough more to match the growth in our population plus enough more to provide the measure of improvement that we consider to be necessary to fulfill the hope that we have for our children?

For the past eighty years, the American people have been investing approximately twenty per cent of their savings in their productive machine, and this investment has enabled American prosperity to grow faster than the population, so that each of us today has far more material goods than our fathers and grandfathers had. This process of investing part of production in the productive machine is called capital formation. The word "capital," incidentally, is all too often misinterpreted and abused. Capital is not a pile of cash kept on hand by a business until "the boss" can decide how and where to spend it. It is, rather, productive capacity, buildings, equipment. It is, in your operation, buildings, stadia and the like. Capital is a seed, a seed which must be nurtured for continual progress in our country.

We still face this problem: Can we build our productive capacity so that it will continue to grow faster than our population? On that basis alone, can we hope that our children will have an easier and more pleasant life measured in terms of material goods? On that basis alone, can we hope that they will have new things—things that today are just in the laboratories? On that basis alone, can we hope that they will have more things, and that they will have better things?

That is only one of the factors, and the least important of the three. The second reason why at this point in its history and in the world's history the American commonwealth, the American economy, the American nation, is the greatest on earth, lies in its human resources. This is the second seed we must nurture.

We have been even more blessed in our human resources than in our natural resources. For reasons that none of us will ever understand, this continent was held back from the knowledge of the civilized world until the world had reached a point where freedom could be understood and practiced, a point in history where men had emerged from the Dark Ages and had overcome many of the feudal handicaps, the handicaps of their feudal lives

and of slavery. When this continent was settled, it was settled by men with a concept of freedom and a love for it in their hearts.

Because it was a new land, because it was hard to get to, and because those who came to it faced a life of hardship and risk, only the brave, only the men with courage and vision, only the men with devotion, dared face the problem.

We are fortunate because the men and women who came here to build a nation came with love of God in their hearts; they came not only as adventurers, they came seeking homes; they came with the hope and understanding of freedom.

That double heritage—the heritage of courage and the heritage of spiritual strength—has been the basis on which our human prosperity has rested. The combination of those human characteristics and the material opportunities that men found here has been unbeatable. Even more valuable than the material values have been the human values.

The early seeds of our material wealth were imported from abroad. It has been only within the last fifty years or so that our status as a nation has changed from that of a creditor to a debtor. Now the rest of the world looks to us for material aid and we are in a position to supply it. I wish I could say the same for our spiritual leadership.

This has been a kind of melting pot. The men and women who came to us brought with them all of the varied cultures of the Old World, and so we have all the strengths, the traditions and the heritages of many races. Always—over all these years, even to the present time—it has been the brave, the courageous, the noble, who would dare the adventure of the New World.

We have, however, reached the point in America where we can no longer import our spiritual strength. We have to conserve what we have. We have to develop it in the later generations of our immigrants. And it seems to me it is in that field that colleges such as yours can make an important and undying contribution, in their ability to conserve, rebuild, strengthen the faith of the men whom they serve, and through them the faith of the American people—because the great problem in America today is the problem of personal faith. There isn't any question about our material ability to produce. The great question is about the ability of our people to use the capacity and the facili-

ties that we have with the same faith and courage with which our fathers used their more limited abilities.

Industry's need for wise leadership and education's need for a share in the wealth that industry produces have built up a vital partnership between them.

This partnership expresses industry's need for wiser leadership to manage its ever more intricate operation. Therefore industry, as represented by the people who share in its ownership, must be prepared to use part of its profit cheerfully to accept its responsibility for the adequate financing of our educational system. If it wishes schools like yours to continue, it must be prepared to supply the funds they need. Only thus can it hope for the kind of leadership it must have.

The ascending spiral of greatness in America has risen because industry has produced wealth, which in turn has supported educational institutions, which in their turn have supplied leadership to industry in order that with each succeeding generation it might produce more wealth, and set the circle in motion again. As long as we can have greater production, better education and better leadership, the spiral will ascend.

Those two seeds—our material resources developed into a vast supply of productive capital and our spiritual resources—need still another ingredient if we are to hope that our children in the future will have a better life than we had, and that third thing is as old as the other two, or older. I have already suggested that the men who conquered this continent brought it with them in their hearts. That ingredient is freedom.

Freedom is the indispensable atmosphere in which men and industry grow strong and great. Those who would destroy us seek first to weaken and degrade our sense of freedom. One of the most hopeful things in the current situation is the fact that the American people are again becoming concerned about freedom. We are all concerned with it. We are all trying to re-understand it, revalue it, determine its price.

In an atmosphere of freedom, and under the philosophy of the individual enterprise system, each generation, as I have indicated, has been able to produce more wealth than it consumed, and plow back some of that wealth for future production.

But important as the seed of capital invested in industry has

been, there has been another field in which the seed of capital has been planted—and must be planted—if we are to match our expanding physical plant with human leadership that develops fast enough to control and operate it. This seed of capital is represented by the money invested in our educational system.

In looking to the schools to supply leaders, the nation realizes that leadership cannot exist in a vacuum.

It can only be manifest when men find problems to solve and challenges with which they can demonstrate their ability. It is industry which provides these, either directly or indirectly, in terms of the professions and other services which eventually rest on the wealth that industry produces.

I am not going to stop too long to talk about freedom. President Stassen commented well upon it this morning. I am sure we are all in agreement on three things in this regard: First, that freedom is not a legal thing, freedom is a spiritual thing; it is a part of a man's spiritual resources, or it doesn't exist. Men carry freedom with them, they do not find it created for them.

The second thing is that freedom is a means, and not an end. We are not interested in leadership for freedom, we are really interested in leadership in freedom, which is the ultimate end which is the hope of all men, because without freedom men cannot find happiness.

The third—and currently the most important thing—is that it is indivisible. Of late, there has grown up in America the conception that freedom should be spelled in the plural. They count them, they list them, they describe them, as though there were so many freedoms that we can afford to throw away some in order to gain something that temporarily seems to be of greater value to us. I am sure that most of you here have heard discussions about freedom of enterprise as well as you have heard discussions about academic freedom. The inference usually is that these two freedoms are encroaching upon each other, that they are antagonistic—that to a man in the academic atmosphere there is something suspect about freedom of enterprise, and that businessmen suspect academic freedom. We need to learn that there is only one freedom, and while it manifests itself to us in many ways, according to our activities and our interests, we, in

industry, cannot permit academic freedom to be weakened without expecting eventually to find freedom of enterprise destroyed. The reverse is equally true. Those in academic circles who countenance the weakening of freedom of enterprise, whether they know it or not, are making a hole in their own loved concept of freedom.

We need material prosperity, we need spiritual strength. We can only hope that these will be as effective in the future as they have been in the past, if we can preserve the atmosphere of freedom without which men cannot grow.

I visualize the relationship between American industry and business and American education in terms of a spiral. It seems to me that in this spiral which we hope will lead up in ever-widening circles to a happier life for the generation still ahead, each of us has his part. Because I am in industry, may I break into the spiral where industry begins?

We, in industry, have the responsibility for earning the means by which an even happier life shall be achieved. We have the responsibility for operating business and industry so that it makes enough of a profit to do two things: to make enough of a profit to be reinvested in industry itself so that the productive capacity can increase as fast as the needs of the people, or faster; and it must also make enough of a profit so that there will be more to invest in education.

In addition to that, we, in industry, need men. Industry in terms of buildings and machines and processes and formulas is dead and sterile; it has no life without the men who can supply it with imagination, with courage, with leadership, with a vision for the new horizons that are still ahead.

It is a great part of the business of education to supply that leadership, to supply men trained with those spiritual qualities which will enable America to grow and enable those spirals to spread wide and high in terms of the happiness of the next generation.

As the spiral grows, we, in industry, must supply education with the financial resources on which it operates. And, in turn, education owes it to the partnership to supply men of leadership, men with wisdom, men with understanding, men with courage and men with spiritual strength.

Your students—our future associates—must have the hope that the things they have learned may be put to constructive use, that somewhere in life outside of college they will find the problems and the challenges and the opportunities and the privileges for which they are preparing.

We, who in this generation are the managers of industry, cannot escape the responsibility for so managing our industry that those challenges and opportunities will be waiting for the boys when they come out. Not easy jobs, not sinecures, but the same kind of opportunities that we had and our fathers had.

And then, in turn, they must take their place in the spiral of trusteeship to see that their sons have the educational opportunities and the opportunities in industry to widen and heighten the spiral of prosperity.

For your part, let me urge you to try again and again to make your students return to the old concept that work is essential to success. The effect of the war on some of our boys was to create an attitude that work is no longer necessary, that the world owes them a living. Another effect on some is the result of military discipline, namely, a desire to have someone else make decisions for them. These attitudes can lead only to stultifying beaurocracy.

In partnership between industry and education, of course, freedom is still the indispensable atmosphere, and we can lose everything for both by default if we in our generation fail to accept the responsibility for the courageous operation of the free enterprise system.

We can lose the tradition of free enterprise, we can lose the tradition of the free school, if we do not have the ability or the courage to make the necessary investment both in industry and in education.

There are some people in America who distrust the basic American process. Such people would shackle both industry and education.

If that time ever comes, the spiral of American progress would soon flatten out, and America's greatness, like that of Nineveh and Tyre, would become a legend and not a living force.

But if our partnership is energetic and sincere, this spiral will not flatten out. Instead, we shall be a step nearer the hope of

the great Lincoln who, in closing his Gettysburg Address, said:

. . . we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

WORKSHOPS IMPROVE COLLEGE TEACHING

N. E. BINGHAM

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF THE TEACHING OF SCIENCE,
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

FOR a number of years with increasing popularity, the workshop has been filling a need in the in-service education of teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Only lately has it been deemed of worth as a vehicle for the education of college teachers. Possibly late recognition of its value stems from the fact that the workshop method is foreign to college teachers. The adage still holds that a teacher teaches as he has been taught. True it is also that he who would teach must never cease to learn. These two ideas pose a problem for the college administrator who wishes to promote good college teaching and good college learning.

In the workshop which is truly a cooperative guild of learners, where there is a common meeting-ground of interest, and which operates on the principle of activity, not receptivity, we have a setting where college teachers can share contributions and together pursue new directions in teaching. Visiting consultants help analyze problems, motivate discussions and bring to the fore a stimulating interchange of ideas. This unifying effect of group thinking can and does have far-reaching results.

Queens College in Charlotte, North Carolina, has pioneered during the past several years by having a workshop for its faculty and administrative staff just preceding the fall term.

The first of these workshops was devoted to the reorganization of the curriculum. This resulted in their divisional system of courses. The second dealt with the student personnel program. It resulted in improved student counseling service. Educating for Christian citizenship became the theme for the third workshop. Attention was focused upon the ultimate goals of education. From this workshop the faculty became deeply aware of the unique role of a Christian oriented liberal arts college.

The theme of the fourth workshop held in the fall of 1949 was, "The Motivation and Techniques of Effective Teaching."

Possibly for the first time in history, an entire liberal arts faculty, administrative staff with invited guests and consultants, concentrated their efforts for a week on the improvement of teaching at the college level. A most commendable achievement it was, since the central activity of any faculty member is teaching. The success of the venture reflects the able leadership of the administration and the careful cooperative work of the pre-planning committee. Personnel of the workshop included forty-five faculty from Queens College—six of whom are new this year—, a representative from Agnes Scott College, Center College, Davidson College, Guilford College, Furman University, Mary Baldwin College, the Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and two consultants, one a former Rhodes Scholar and professor of political science at Emory University, and the author of this article.

The Program: The faculty members opened the session with preliminary statements on "The Purposes of Teaching" and "What is Good Teaching." The consultants talked with the group on "Goals of Teaching" and "The Relationship of Motivation to Teaching." Discussion followed with the first afternoon given over to vivid descriptions by each workshop member on "The Best and Worst Teacher I Ever Had," which was unexpectedly effective in arousing interest and defining problems for further consideration. The evening was spent on organization for the work of the week, with the formation of groups for more intensive study in one of four areas, (1) The Goals of Teaching, (2) The Motivation of Students, (3) Techniques of Effective Teaching, and (4) The Evaluation of Teaching.

Each day consultants or faculty gave some over-all picture or orientation for discussion on one of the above topics. Excellent analyses were presented by faculty members on such methods as lecture, recitation, discussion, project, laboratory, the seminar, the panel; other unusual techniques included the field trip, use of multi-sensory aids and the place of the library.

Group meetings for further study paralleled the general discussions. By the end of the week each group had thoughtfully written and presented to the whole workshop for evaluation, a report of their combined ideas on one of the four main topics. On the last evening the reports, refined by total group analyses,

were presented for acceptance. Typical of the unified workshop approach were the friendly noon luncheons, a picnic supper, the informal chats and an evening of square-dancing. The workshop ended on a forward note of implications and projections by consultants, group chairmen and the administration.

Evaluation: As in the preceding workshops, the outstanding values are to be found in the process of group thinking so characteristic of an efficient workshop. Several criteria which might be used in judging the effectiveness of a workshop are:

1. Is the scope of the work quickly and clearly defined?
2. Do workshop members share in selecting the area in which they will work?
3. Is there at all times a free interplay of ideas?
4. Is there at all times a high level of motivation?
5. Are the most effective techniques of teaching being used?
6. Do the workshop members turn to the library in connection with problems that arise?
7. Are all of the members participating, i.e. contributing, evaluating, projecting next steps?
8. Do all the members share in the final appraisal of what has been accomplished?

With regard to each of these criteria the workshop ranks high. When these criteria are applied to the individual sessions, it becomes clear that the most effective sessions were the ones in which the group shared most actively rather than those where the consultants or individual faculty members made prepared speeches. Such speeches, however, were important in that they focused the attention of the group on the problems to be considered. The splendid group reports served as the basis for the most stimulating sessions. But more significant than the reports is the growth that took place during their preparation and presentation.

Certainly this workshop can be considered eminently successful in the following respects:

1. Cooperative work by the staff built an invaluable esprit de corps.
2. New staff members were so oriented that they are in a position to work more effectively.

3. Via the workshop each faculty member became increasingly aware of the unique goals of his institution and in a sense became rededicated to them.
4. Through an exchange of ideas each one recognized the points of view held by others and the unusual procedures practiced in various departments. Such practices were considered and evaluated by all in terms of student learnings and of the goals of the college.
5. Some realization of the essential unity of subject matter came from the interchange of ideas among department representatives.

Perhaps as a result departmental lines will become less evident. This should be a point of departure to help students integrate their learnings.

Factors which contributed to the success of this workshop are: (1) the diverse backgrounds brought together by including representatives from several colleges and universities, (2) the interested and cooperative administration which provided a fertile setting for free interchange of ideas, (3) the comfortable and hospitable environment on the Queens College campus, (4) the pre-planning shared in by many of the faculty, and (5) the dedication to Christian leadership evident among the personnel.

Projections: To effect maximum gain from any workshop there should be follow-up during the school year. From this particular workshop these lines of investigation might prove fruitful:

1. That there be several faculty seminars on college teaching and college learning based on a consideration of a critique like Ordway Tead's *College Teaching and College Learning*.¹
2. That the faculty attempt to find ways of utilizing the library more effectively. This study could be carried on by members of each division acting as a committee with the librarian.
3. That the faculty undertake a more adequate evaluation of their offerings. This could be done within each of the divisions of the college. Many colleges are moving toward the use of more comprehensive examinations, either

¹ Tead, Ordway, *College Teaching and College Learning*, Yale University Press, 1949.

covering a longer period of time or covering a wider range of objectives. Such a study might include any or all of the following approaches:

- a. Increased student motivation through better placement or better provision for individual needs through more adequate evaluation.
- b. Appraisal and improvement of courses through the use of student appraisal, for example, a student opinion-aire.
- c. Improvement in course examinations as a basis for marks.

Summary Statement: Experience in this workshop indicates that a week is the minimum time a faculty should spend in a workshop experience, for every minute was packed with activity; it was not until the afternoon of the last day that the group reports were acceptable to all concerned. Most significant was the growth that occurred from the interaction among faculty members attempting the solution of a common problem. Undoubtedly, this workshop will enhance the teaching of its members. Perhaps a workshop is the most effective way to improve college teaching.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT AS A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT SEES IT

IRVIN STEWART

PRESIDENT, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

FROM the standpoint of one university president (and I can speak only for one), that student government is best which makes greatest contribution to the objectives for which the institution was created. That, in a single sentence, is the essence of what I want to say tonight—but, since you were good enough to invite me to come several hundred miles to say it, I should like to elaborate the theme.

At the outset there should be a clear understanding as to the source of authority under which the university operates. Who is responsible for the institution? In the case of my own institution, the law is quite clear. Both authority and responsibility are vested in a board of governors appointed by the governor of the state. In other cases the source will be different; but I suspect that in most cases the source of authority for student government in the final analysis is not the student body, but the administration through which the board of governors or the trustees act.

The objectives of our educational system and of institutions within that system have been stated in many ways. For our discussion I should like to adopt President Conant's statement that one purpose of the system of public education in the United States is "to develop effective citizens of a free democratic country." (Conant, "Education in a Divided World," page 74.)

Retaining all control of student affairs in the hands of the administration is not conducive to a realization of the Conant definition. From the standpoint of lazy administrators, it would be nice to turn over to the students responsibility in all cases where they would not annoy the faculty too much. Fortunately or unfortunately, this is not practical. In trying to assess the contribution of student government to the development of effec-

NOTE: Address at Conference on Student Government, Duke University, December 1, 1949.

tive citizens of a free democratic country, we should keep in mind both the students who are governing at a particular time and those who are governed at that time. That which would contribute to the most rapid development of the governing is not necessarily so effective in the development of the governed. One function of the university administration may sometimes be to keep the governing from developing too rapidly at the expense of the governed.

In a university such as this, there are freshmen just out of high school at one extreme; and at the other, those mature students who are about ready to go out as doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers or members of some other profession. The members of this latter group should be ready to assume their places as responsible citizens in the communities in which they settle; and the administration might well be ready to entrust them with the same type of responsibility which they will shortly bear as citizens.

The freshmen are in an entirely different category: generally speaking, they lack maturity, they lack experience in exercising judgment, they come from different home and school environments which have varied widely. To give them too much freedom initially might interfere with the primary purpose for which the institution was created and for which the freshmen are enrolled. If this should not be true for those freshmen temporarily vested with authority, it might easily become so for those who might become the victims of poor judgment. Too great a deviation from the purpose for which the institution was created would react promptly against those legally entrusted with responsibility for the conduct of the institution.

The problem thus becomes one of giving the student government that amount of authority and responsibility which will be most conducive to the development of the individual students. To err on the side of too little authority and responsibility is to fail to make the most effective use of a very real opportunity for development; to err in the other direction may make some students the victims of poor judgment by their fellows who are temporarily clothed with power. In practice this means that the relations of the administration to student government must be elastic. As a particular group of student leaders show that they

exercise authority with restraint, the amount of authority given them can be expanded. Conversely, as they show a lack of restraint and an absence of good judgment, the area of authority must be constricted. Obviously, this is not an easy solution upon which one can go to sleep.

In my opinion the delegation to a student group of the authority to decide and to act carries with it the right to make mistakes; it implies the right to make decisions other than those which the university administrator might have made in the same circumstances. Otherwise it is a mirage, a form without substance. Yet an administrator would be blind if he did not recognize that occasionally a student election can be as dirty as the dirtiest of regular elections. Further, it is not beyond imagination that a group successful at a student election might attempt to arrange things so as to insure the continuance of a particular group in office. I shall readily grant that this is not an unusual procedure in the local, state and national political arenas; but it is not one which should be permitted on a campus. No portion of a student population should be deprived arbitrarily of its chance to share responsibility for student activities. Moreover, an enforced continuing dominance of a particular group would not be helpful to that growth of the entire student body to which the institution is dedicated. In my opinion, the administration has the duty to impose limits beyond which student government should not be permitted to go.

Those limits are flexible. As a student generation shows itself able to handle responsibility fairly, the limits can be permitted to be so broad that student government in practice is hardly aware of their existence. Perhaps in a particular school the history of student government may be such that the limits disappear from view. In another institution there may be very narrow limits imposed because of the poor judgment of student leaders (or perhaps of university administrators) of prior generations. There is no doubt that the traditions of institutions play an important and sometimes controlling part in the determination of the relations between the administration and the student government. An attempt to prepare the perfect constitution for student government and to make it effective in all institutions would be as vain as was the adoption in the Latin

American republics of constitutions modeled after that in the United States when the inhabitants of those countries did not have the background out of which the Constitution of the United States grew.

Thus far I have talked about restraints on student government imposed by the administration. Equally important are those imposed by the students themselves. An administration should go slowly in attempting to entrust to a student government greater authority than the student body wants conferred upon that government. Student government is frequently established by constitutions adopted by student vote. The limitations in those constitutions may arise from the desire of the students to impose limits upon their own government, in the same fashion that the people of the United States and of the several states have imposed limitations upon their governments in written constitutions. This leads to an occasional unjust criticism of an administration, when the administration is blamed for the failure of student government to possess some power which the student constitution withholds from student government.

One of the real difficulties about student government which troubles the university administrator is that if the job is well done it requires the expenditure of a tremendous amount of time and energy by a limited number of students. I believe that it could be established fairly easily that the average student-body president who tries to do his job constructively will suffer at least a ten-point drop in his scholastic average. The task can be so broad and so time-consuming that the conscientious officer in student government finds his academic work taking a secondary place and he may come up to final examinations having to burn a great deal of midnight oil in order to keep pace with his classmates. Knowing that, the university administrator has some reluctance to see student government charged with responsibilities which he knows will impose a heavy burden upon the students involved.

Another of the realities of student government which faces the university administrator is that the student offices may not be staffed adequately to do properly some of the things which are proper functions of student government. The administrator knows the extent to which he depends upon others for the staff

work necessary for his own job. Frequently, the newly elected officer of student government has no conception of the amount of work involved in a particular undertaking; and being usually without prior experience in administration, he may not know how to handle an assignment in an efficient manner. Clearly it is a part of the process of development to let him find out, but it is up to the university president to help see that he does not too greatly imperil his academic career in the process.

The elasticity which is desirable in the relationship between the student government and the administration requires clearly understood channels between students and the administration. This does not mean, of course, that the president of the institution should participate in all decisions on student affairs. Far from it. One of the irritating things about his job is that the president can not devote as much time to personal contact with students as he would wish. It does mean, however, that at some clearly defined place in the administration there is some one to whom the student government can go when it needs advice; and the person in that spot must know which matters properly should be discussed with the president. Further, the officers of the student government should have the right to appeal to the president in any case where they feel that they have been dealt with unfairly or hastily.

One of the perennial sources of potential friction between student government and the administration of the university is the field of student publications. The relations between the administration and the student newspaper may have progressed smoothly for years and then some incident may occur which will give rise to heated charges of censorship. Usually the situation is in the nature of a tempest in a teapot, which might well have been resolved by a heart-to-heart talk between administrative officials and the editor of the student newspaper. Naturally the student editor has not attained the maturity of judgment which he will have in another decade or two if he stays in journalistic work, nor is he operating under such an acute awareness of the libel laws as he will later.

The most difficult problem, and one where trouble arises most frequently in connection with student publications, is in the field of the so-called humor magazines. A substantial part of

the contents of some, if not most, college humor magazines is the result of a scissors and paste-pot operation in which the humor magazines borrow material from each other or in which old stories are retold using the names of persons who are currently in the campus spotlight. For years the magazine may be published without incident; and then an editor will come along whose idea of humor is to clip some of the filthiest material available in the numerous alleged humor magazines which the students can buy at the corner newsstand. The administration may then expect to be the recipient of numerous sarcastic and sometimes nasty communications about the standards of student life. The problem confronting the administration is how to protect the reputation of the institution from the consequences of the perverted sense of humor of the student who happens to be editor at the particular time. Although it might be possible that the student body would completely disassociate itself from the contents of a particular issue of the magazine, the defense of a dirty joke may be built into a crusade against censorship. The matter becomes a burning issue on some campus across the United States ever so often, though fortunately on any particular campus the question recurs at infrequent intervals. There are no objective standards which can be made to cover all the possibilities either in the publication of a humor magazine or in the selection of its editor. Fortunately over the years in a particular institution a *modus vivendi* can be developed which permits the publication of the humor magazine with a moderate degree of satisfaction on both sides. The best protection which the university administrator can have is in the good judgment of a sensible student government which holds the reputation of the institution in as high esteem as any of its administrative officials.

Let me cite an illustration of what I consider to be a poor type of working relationship between the school administration and the student government. Two or three years ago, a graduate of a West Virginia high school went to a military school in another state. After several months there, he was brought up before the student honor court on charges of cheating on an examination and was ordered expelled from the school.

The boy later applied for admission to West Virginia Univer-

sity. Normally we will not admit to the university a student who has been expelled from another institution, but we agreed to look into this particular case. The boy's story was that he had never wanted to go to military school, but had entered there because of parental insistence. He rebelled at the military discipline and was tactless in his open expressions of discontent. One evening he was met at the door of the library and without notice was conducted before the honor court. There he was charged with cheating, a charge which he denied. He was subjected to questioning over a period of several hours, during which time a bright light was shown in his eyes in the approved Hollywood and Moscow manner. This went on until about three o'clock in the morning, at the end of which time he signed a paper which he could not read because of the effect of the intense light shining in his eyes over a long period. The paper was an admission that he had cheated on the examination. On the next day he repudiated the confession and the president of the school was asked to reverse the decision of the honor court. The request was refused on the ground that decisions of the honor court in matters of cheating were final.

The internal evidence of cheating was very slender. A check with the boy's high school principal and teachers showed that he had been a good student and that there had never been the slightest suspicion of cheating in his high school career. His standing in his home community was of the best.

Obviously, we were not in a position to sit as a court to review charges brought months before on a situation arising several hundreds of miles away, but it seemed to us that there was a reasonable presumption that the honor court had been mistaken. The only reason which the victim could offer for the incident was that cheating was widespread and the student leaders feared the loss of the honor system if some action were not taken. He thought that he might have been picked as a scapegoat because of his outspoken dislike of the school and because he was an out-of-state student without ties in the state. As it seemed to us unlikely that the boy would have had such a change of character in the course of a few months, we admitted him on probation. He is now making good in every way as a student at West Virginia University.

The relation of the honor court to the administration of the school involved seems to me to be completely unsound. Whether or not the honor court was correct in its decision, I believe that the administration had the responsibility of checking upon the procedure used by the court and of assuring itself that the decision reached was probably the correct one in a case where the extreme penalty of expulsion from school, with a possible warping of the life of a fellow student, was involved.

In our daily lives we are prone to take for granted the privileges which come to us as American citizens. We overlook the fact that it was our forefathers who first obtained them, sometimes at considerable cost of life and limb. Each generation should earn those freedoms by living up to the obligations which they imply. A similar situation surrounds the position of student government at a given moment. It is largely the product of the effort of previous student generations. It is not something to be regarded lightly. Rather, responsibility in student government is something to be earned by its proper exercise. Only so, can it be preserved and extended for future generations of students.

To me, that student government is best which vests in the student body the greatest amount of authority and responsibility which the students are prepared to exercise properly at any time. The administration should stand ready with advice and assistance as needed to make that government a success. Prepared, if necessary, to protect the individual student and the institution against excesses due to inexperience or bad judgment, it should recognize that student government is an invaluable tool "to develop effective citizens of a free democratic country." That is the picture of student government as one university president sees it.

THE NEW LOOK: THE CLASSROOM LECTURER IS NOT OBSOLETE

PHILIP J. GREEN

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, QUEENS COLLEGE

MANY men and women in the business of teaching seem to think that most, if not all, the shortcomings of the classroom can be traced to the procedure known as the lecture method. To them the lecture method is a hang-over from the Middle Ages and therefore is obsolete. They offer several substitutes: such as the discussion, forum and the recitation. Any or all of these may be used to advantage, but they should be used with caution. The critics seem to think that the problem can be solved only by the use of the tomahawk. There is sharp disagreement here, for most teachers believe that improvement rather than the axe is what is needed. It would be wise for lecturers, public as well as collegiate, to pause over the word "improvement."

How may one improve one's style? I propose to offer a few suggestions which should be perused thoughtfully by the young and might be helpful to the graybeards as well. Webster says that a lecture is "A discourse delivered on any subject; esp., a formal discourse intended for instruction." This definition does not, or least should not, describe the classroom lecturer. It suggests spats, striped pants and tails, and any classroom lecturer who came to class in such a garb would be considered a freak and rightly.

If the lecture is not what Webster says it is, then what is it? It is impossible to define it with complete satisfaction and it cannot be done with Websterian brevity. The critics like to quote the wornout witicism that "The lecture method is the method by which the professor's notes are transferred to the student's notebooks without passing through the minds of either." This old saw has become proverbial among the critics and so often is it quoted that one may wonder by whom and when was it coined. One very wise critic, not long ago, suggested Socrates for he was both a wit and a critic of other men's

NOTE: Address delivered before the Workshop of Queens College, N. C., September, 1949.

methods. But I fail to find it accredited to him in my Plato. Yet he may have thought it up for he is reported to have been a little averse to work; and certainly one must work to be a good lecturer.

The famed Socratic method, which is attributed to him, is more or less a combination of all the methods in use today—the discussion, the recitation, the forum and the lecture. It is usually thought of as question and answer or discussion but Socrates asked most of the questions, just as the professor must do today and like the modern professor, Socrates found that he was compelled to answer most of the questions or at least to expand the thoughts of his pupils. This, it seems to me, is a rather bumpy way of lecturing. It reminds me of an airplane trying to keep a straight course against sudden bursts of wind that bounces it around willy-nilly.

The lecture may proceed, say the critics, with students either asleep or awake. No argument on this point. But all other methods of classroom procedure assume that students are always alert and fully prepared and anxious, even champing the bit, to take part in the daily recitation. The assumption is grossly incorrect. Some one, a short time ago, asked the President of the University of California how many students he had at his university. He replied, "About one in a hundred." It would be wonderful if some one could find a method that would make students out of the other ninety-nine.

The witticism mentioned above may describe the student's reaction to the lecture on the spot for he does not have time to think if he is busy taking notes. He is supposed to do that later when he is studying and expanding the notes. I believe it would be pertinent to ask, what is the purpose of higher education if it isn't to acquaint students with the fundamentals of the subject pursued? And I may ask, is it possible to think and to form judgments without the basic knowledge of the fundamentals? I believe it is the business of the colleges and universities to give their students fundamental facts which they may use as tools to help them to think and to form judgments. To give them the fundamentals is the aim of the lecturer. I do not believe that students attend universities and colleges at great expense to their families to listen to themselves or to fellow

students expound their views on a given subject. I rather think they and their parents expect that instructors, whose training and experience are much broader than that of the students, will conduct the classes.

It should be pointed out, moreover, that lecturing is probably the oldest form of transmitting knowledge from one who has it to one who wishes to possess it. It not only predominated in the college and university classroom, but in one form or another it is used by parents, Sunday School teachers, ministers, politicians, radio commentators and hosts of others who wish to inform the ignorant. No satisfactory substitute for it has been invented and this is true in spite of the fact that certain subjects may seem to lend themselves more readily to some other procedure. Other methods of classroom performance, such as the discussion method, forum and recitation, are by no means perfect and can be subjected to the same criticisms that have been heaped upon the lecture method.

If the lecture is here to stay—and it is—criticism should be constructive rather than destructive. How, then, may the lecturing technique be improved? That depends on the underlying conditions involved and no cut-and-dried rule can be laid down. Each instructor must develop and improve, or work out, his own classroom procedure and he will do this as he grows in knowledge of his subject and in experience. He cannot be helped very much from the outside (criticism of one's technique by superiors is extremely dangerous) for classroom procedure depends upon the ability, personality and character of the instructor much more than it does upon the technique used. I submit that these traits are the most effective agents of the lecturer. Students will listen to instructors who exhibit them and will not listen to those who do not seem to possess them. A good lecturer strives to convince his students that he is interested in them. He will not scold or use unnecessary sarcasm, and, on the whole, he will stick to his subject. At the beginning of the period, the able lecturer will not plunge abruptly into the topic. He will approach his subject subtly. He may easily arouse the interest of his students by commenting on some topic of general interest or ask a few questions drawn from the previous lesson and point to an incident of current interest which

has similar ramifications. Or he may tell a story, mention a clipping or a new book he has recently read. He should vary his opening attack from day to day. In this way, without his students realizing it, he has prepared their minds to receive the more formal part of his lecture.

The able teacher encourages questions from the floor at any and all times during the period and answers them with completeness. He should never permit himself or the class wag to indulge in trivial matters. The young instructor should never announce the fact that he is a neophyte or that he is not informed, for his students may accept him at face value and wonder why they drew such an *ignoramus* for a teacher. On the other hand, a teacher of many years' experience and whose reputation for sound scholarship is well known, may begin a class by saying that he does not know much about the subject without damaging his reputation. But, on the whole, the instructor gains nothing by apologizing for his shortcomings.

Some teachers indulge in mannerisms which are definite stop-lights, such as peculiar gestures, punctuating the beginning and the ending of a thought with an "ah" or an "uh," or with a peculiar snicker, or by laughing noisily at their own stale jokes. Instructors who practice such peculiarities are inviting criticism. Not only criticism, but students will also mimic these peculiarities with great glee outside the classroom.

Other instructors indulge in risqué stories to get a laugh. This is dangerous; for students will laugh at the professor as quickly as they will laugh with him. He will soon be noted for his smutty yarns and little else. Legitimate humor, used sparingly, has an important place in the lecture, as it affords an opportunity for both teacher and students to relax, clears the atmosphere of tension and renews flagging energy for the problem to follow. The teacher who overdoes the humorous may be praised for his wit and then criticized as a poor teacher.

Some classroom lectures develop the impression that the classroom is a forum for the expounding of views other than those prescribed for the course. Students will "bait" the teacher who has this weakness, encourage him to "kill" many class-periods discussing irrelevant matter and then make fun of him after the class has retreated to the bull-session.

Students, as a rule, have few complaints about delivery if the lecturer's voice is loud enough to be heard. They soon tire of straining to hear and will quickly lose interest if they have difficulty in understanding what is being said. They do not care whether the lecture is delivered impromptu, from notes or outlines, from manuscript, from memory or from a combination of these. The impromptu presentation is perhaps the poorest way to present a classroom lecture. The few instructors whom I have known to make a practice of this type of lecturing were criticized by their students for backing, repeating and stalling. I once heard a distinguished teacher remark, "If I come to class with an empty head my students will leave the class with an empty head." I doubt that any teacher would be so foolish or such a glutton for work as to write out and then memorize a lecture—not more than once anyway.

Reading a lecture from manuscript is less effective than using notes or outlines because few people read effectively. The lecturer, however, should not be completely tied to his notes. Nor should he fall into the habit of verbatim dictation of materials, especially of long passages. These should be mimeographed or not given at all in the classroom.

The best test of any method is its effectiveness. The instructor may have to wait a long time to discover how effective his methods are. His current students may flatter him for personal reasons and he can never be sure about them. But when the praise comes from former students, he may be sure that his work has not been in vain.

The lecture method, moreover, offers the instructor opportunities to display leadership, personality, skill and ability. And when he combines these traits even in a small degree, the experience is thrilling and one few students forget. Students do not necessarily remember the details of a lecture, but the lecturer should not be as concerned about how much they retain as he is about how much stimulation they get from the performance. In other words, the lecturer is more concerned about arousing the interest and intellectual curiosity of his students than he is about how much they remember of what he is saying.

The critics claim that students will not make daily preparations for a lecture course. So what? This is not the fault of

the method for they are no more industrious when other methods are used. To date there has not been developed any method that induces every member of a large class to take part in discussion at every class-meeting. Many teachers believe that the lecture method is as successful as any in securing maximum effort from students. An experiment at Muskingum College, some years ago, points in this direction. Muskingum divided its Modern European History course for freshmen into two groups, A and B. Group A had 50 students and was taught by the lecture method. Group B had 48 students and was taught by the discussion method. Each group was divided into sections. The length of the class period, the number of meetings per week and the instructor were the same for all sections. Assignments and subject matter were also the same for all sections.

Students were permitted to ask questions and make comments during the course of the lecture, but the instructor answered all questions. Student participation was much greater in the discussion group than it was in the lecture group. The instructor directed the discussion but did not dominate it. Without going into the details of the experiment, it is interesting to note that the students of the lecture group made higher grades at the end of the semester than did the students of the discussion group.

This one experiment does not prove that the lecture method is superior to the discussion method but the implication is clear. It is not to be expected that all the 48 students in group B took part in the discussions, but a larger percentage did than in group A. The report does not say what percentage of group B took part in the discussions. Nor does it say whether the students of group B were more faithful in making daily preparations than were those in group A. The fact that group A made higher semester grades than group B seems to justify the assumption that the students of Group A were more faithful in making their preparations. Anyone who has had experience with discussion groups of any kind, public as well as collegiate, knows that people who are the least informed often try to dominate the discussion. Many ill-prepared students develop skill in this time-killing procedure.

Regardless of the criticism hurled at the classroom lecturer, he is still supreme in the classroom. I do not believe that this is

due to obstinacy on the part of the teachers, but rather to the mental inertia of the students. Until this trait of the student body has been eliminated, or almost eliminated, the lecture method of conducting classes will continue to dominate the classroom. We point to the extracurricular activities as the chief obstacle to mental assiduity, but there is plenty of evidence to show that mental laziness was as common on college campuses in earlier times as it is today.

Too often the instructor, who tries to use some other procedure, finds that his students will not respond and he either must lecture or dismiss the class.

It is generally accepted that not more than ten or fifteen per cent of any class will make daily preparations or at least not more than this percentage will take part in class discussion from day to day. What is more discouraging, it is usually the same group, week after week, that responds to the instructor's questions. After a few weeks of such performance on the part of the class, the instructor gives up in despair and finishes the semester's work by lecturing. The students settle back comfortably in their chairs and may or may not transfer the instructor's notes to their notebooks without them passing through the minds of either.

THE FUNCTION OF MORGAN STATE COLLEGE AS A STATE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MARTIN D. JENKINS

PRESIDENT, MORGAN STATE COLLEGE

IT IS my purpose in this inaugural address to define the future program of Morgan State College in light of its status as a state institution serving a Negro clientele. I do this in full recognition of the facts that in a large measure this program is already in operation, and that the determination of the objectives and program of an institution is a cooperative venture to which many persons in the college community contribute their views. As the leader of this enterprise, however, it is altogether right and fitting, albeit venturesome, that I attempt a definition of the kind of institution the college should seek to be.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COLLEGE

The prime function of an institution of higher education is to enrich the society of which it is a part. Its prime responsibilities are the development of its students, the conservation and enhancement of knowledge and the raising of the cultural level of the state and the nation. Morgan State College must assume and discharge these responsibilities. To the extent that it does so, the state and the nation will be the richer in human resources.

Morgan State College, as a state institution, must define its objectives and formulate its program in part, at least, in light of the needs of the people of the state. The quality and educational level of students who come to the college from the high schools of the state will determine in large measure the quality and level of its educational program. The occupational pattern of the state, not only as it is, but as it is likely to become, will give direction to the vocational objectives of the institution. Adult education and other community services will be organized in view of the status, needs and desires of the people of the state. Research activities will be formulated, in part at least, in terms of the fact that we are a Maryland institution.

NOTE: Address delivered December 17, 1948.

This is not to say that the college can be provincial in outlook or unduly restrictive in program. Its students are a part of the national and world community. Many of its graduates will migrate to other states and to other countries. Thus, their needs can in no sense be defined only in terms of state or regional boundaries. Its students must, of course, know world history, world geography, world politics; they must know the peoples of the world, their contributions and their problems. Nevertheless, the local situation must and should constitute the point of departure for the educational program of the institution.

Morgan State College, as an institution serving directly the Negro population, must adapt its program to the needs of that population. Just as its activities are modified by its status as a state institution, they are likewise modified by its status as an institution serving a minority group. Although there are educators who do not concur in this view, I believe the only justification for the existence of an institution with a minority group clientele lies in its ability to meet the special needs of that clientele.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE COLLEGE TO ITS STUDENTS

The first obligation of the college is to its students. At the beginning of each school year, there comes to us a group of hopeful and eager students whom we term freshmen. Four years later, in the normal course of events, approximately half of these students complete their undergraduate college work; the other half, for one reason or another, drop by the wayside. The college has only a short span of time to exert its influence. If we are to make our best contribution to these students, we must have a clear understanding of what we intend to do to and for them, and how we intend to accomplish this aim.

We intend, in a basic way, to discharge the traditional function of the liberal arts college by producing students who are liberally educated. Whatever the career of the college trained person is to be, it is essential that it be undergirded by a well-rounded general education.

I should like every Morgan man and woman to be characterized by the ability to think clearly; to read with understanding and to convey his ideas in clear and concise written and oral ex-

pression; to have a clear understanding of the development and nature of his physical and social environment; to know the history and status of the Negro people and the goals toward which they are striving; to appreciate and participate in the aesthetic aspects of his existence; to have good physical and mental health and a well-balanced personality; to have arrived at a satisfying philosophy of life consistent with Christian ethics; to be free of racial and national prejudices and petty social intolerance; to exemplify in his daily living, habits of courtesy and friendliness, of honesty and integrity, of cleanliness in mind and body, of excellence in achievement, of goodness in behavior; to understand his rights, privileges and responsibilities as an American citizen and as a citizen of the world; to have developed a keen desire to accomplish for the common good; to have a passion for the democratic way of life; to have the courage of his convictions, the desire and willingness to "stand up and be counted" for those things in which he believes.

Now this will be no easy task. I am not so naive as to believe that it can be easily accomplished, or ever perfectly accomplished. But this shall be our goal. We shall strive, all of us at Morgan, teachers, administrators and staff alike, to make of Morgan men and women this kind of men and women.

We shall approach this task well aware of the difficulties which confront us. Like Negro students everywhere, the students who come to Morgan State College reveal in their knowledge, their attitudes and their behavior, the restrictions their environment has placed upon them. Although there are numerous individual exceptions, they come from homes which are poor in the material things and in which the tradition of liberal education is absent. They come, in the main, despite the recent rapid strides made by the public schools of our state, from elementary and secondary schools of low academic level. They experience, in their daily living, social attitudes of contempt and lack of respect which inevitably lead to feelings of frustration and inferiority.

These things we are bound to consider in our educational program and procedures. We realize that our demand for accomplishment must be tempered by sympathetic understanding of the handicaps their experiences have imposed upon our students; that in our teaching a greater measure of effort is demanded than

if we were directing the development of a more highly privileged group; that the physical tools of learning—the buildings, the laboratories, the libraries, the equipment—must be of high quality and utilized in a skillful manner in order to compensate for earlier deficiencies in the life history of our students; that in our day-to-day living with our students we must give to them the personal respect, the democratic regard, of which they are so often deprived; that we must exemplify in our own lives the characteristics of liberally educated men and women in order to provide for our students living examples of the product we are attempting to create.

But a liberal education in these days and for this group of students is not enough. I shall not here take issue with those distinguished educators who hold that this kind of education is the only legitimate kind of higher education. I am convinced, though, that almost all the students served by Morgan State College must face the hard reality of utilizing their collegiate experiences for earning a living.

The program of the college, consequently, must provide for direct vocational competence on the part of its students. In terms of the broad scope of the occupational pattern in our complex society, the liberal arts college can be concerned with relatively few vocations. It has, however, a vital role to play in the preparation of its students for professional, semi-professional and business occupations. We shall consider it our obligation to bring every one of our students well along the road to vocational competence, insofar as an undergraduate institution can do so.

The future prospects are bright for college-trained Negroes who are really capable. As a racial group we have barely begun to participate at a high level in the professional, business and industrial life of the nation. In the words of Mordecai Johnson, "We are just beginning to touch the hem of the garment." It is an arresting fact that under conditions of complete equality in American life, there would be an insufficient number of adequately prepared Negroes to fill high level positions. Indeed, there are serious shortages now.

A general, though not very accurate, picture of these shortages is provided by the United States census data for 1940. If

Negroes were to contribute their proportionate share to certain occupations which require a high level of training, there would be four times as many college teachers, five times as many doctors and dentists, ten times as many pharmacists, seventeen times as many lawyers, twenty times as many chemists, twenty-five times as many proprietors in construction and manufacturing, fifty times as many bookkeepers and accountants, one hundred times as many secretaries as there now are. This statistical picture on a national scale can be verified by observation of the situation in our own state.

These are shortages, yes. But they are opportunities, as well, for Negro youth; they are a challenge, as well, for the institutions serving Negro youth. It is apparent that the intellectual resources of the Negro people have not been developed to the same extent as have those of the general population. This constitutes a type of erosion of human resources which our state can ill afford. It is our responsibility at Morgan State College to conserve these resources and this we propose to do.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE COLLEGE TO ADVANCE THE FRONTIERS OF KNOWLEDGE

The second obligation of the college is that of the conservation and enhancement of knowledge. Advancing the frontiers of knowledge through research in the natural and social sciences and through creative activity in philosophy, literature and the fine arts is a basic function of institutions of higher education.

The modest advances made in understanding the nature of our personal and societal relationships, have come almost entirely as a result of the research activities of social scientists in colleges and universities. A large part of the amazing technological developments of the past half century may be attributed directly to the basic and applied research of chemists, physicists, biologists, mathematicians and engineers on college and university faculties. To a lesser extent, members of humanities departments have made direct contributions to literature, drama, music and the arts. Thus, institutions of higher education have exerted a tremendous influence on our culture through their research and creative contributions.

Research is generally regarded as being more the function of

the university than of the college and there is much justification for this view. In light of the character of higher education facilities in the state, however, Morgan State College must undertake this function. If capable Negro scholars are to have the opportunity to exercise their creative genius to the benefit of society, that opportunity must be provided here.

To the present time, the institution has done very little in the matter of pushing back the frontiers of knowledge. This is, of course, understandable. It has never had those physical facilities which are indispensable to significant research; its teachers have been so heavily overloaded with other duties as to have insufficient time for creative reflection; it is just now beginning to assemble a staff which has the basic qualifications for significant work.

We look, then, to the future. Morgan State College expects to become, in a modest way, a center of scholarship. We expect to assemble a highly competent staff; we can do this for we have available to us some of the most brilliant minds of our generation. We intend to create for this staff an environment in which they can make the contributions of which they are capable. We intend to encourage this staff to engage in all types of scholarly activity, but especially to attack those problems which have particular relevance to the development of the state and to the adjustment of the Negro population. I think that the state will be proud of our contributions as well as aided by them.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE COLLEGE TO THE COMMUNITY

Of the three major obligations of the college, the third is to the community. An institution of higher education, by its very existence, must inevitably influence, to some degree, the life of the community in which it has its setting. The extent of this influence, however, depends in large measure upon the extent to which the institution deliberately designs its program in terms of community needs.

Morgan State College will have no "ivory tower" philosophy. We intend to be a community institution. We will attempt to extend our services to every corner of the state. Owing to our nucleus of highly-trained persons, the largest single group of Negro scholars in the State, and to our position as a recognized

center of knowledge and culture, we are in a particularly privileged position to discharge our responsibilities to the community.

We intend to be a center for the dissemination of knowledge, for the interpretation of the products of scholarship to the people of the state. How essential it is, in these days of complex problems, that our citizenry be an enlightened one. The social obligation of the college in this regard cannot be too greatly stressed. Examination of the social statistics of the Negro population of the state is a depressing experience. In health and mortality, in crime and delinquency, in housing, in educational and occupational attainment, this racial group is far below the level of the white population. Although the task of improving the general level of the Negro population is not wholly an educational one, it is partly so. Whatever the college can do in this regard, we propose to do.

We intend to build up within the state a sentiment and appreciation for the values of higher education. It is especially important that this be done among the Negro population. Too few Negro youth of high ability go to college. In the nation as a whole, in 1940, almost five per cent of the adult white population had finished four years of college, while less than 1.5 per cent of the Negro population in this age group had attained this level of education. In Maryland, in the same year, although Negroes constituted 16.6 per cent of the population, they were only a little more than four per cent of the students enrolled in colleges within the state. I am convinced that the welfare of the state demands a larger proportion of college educated persons in the Negro population. We shall endeavor to attain this end, not for the aggrandizement of Morgan State College, but for the purpose of raising the qualitative level of the population.

We intend, as a part of our community function to constitute a channel of communication in racial matters and to promote harmonious race relations within the state and the nation. Negroes are a minority group in this state. It shall be our purpose to interpret this minority group to the general population: to show their achievements, to reveal their aspirations, to demonstrate their abilities, to explain their eagerness to be contributing members of the commonwealth. We shall attempt to bring to the members of this minority group an understanding of the

responsibilities of citizenship which the privileges of citizenship entail.

We shall interpret, as well, the majority group to the Negro population. I am encouraged by the many examples of improvement in race relations I have observed within recent years; by the many gestures of friendship and understanding on the part of white individuals; by the increasingly large number of white persons, both within and without the state, who reveal a willingness, even an eagerness, to grant to Negroes full privileges of citizenship. I believe that the feelings of bitterness and frustration which are so deeply imbedded in the hearts of Negro people would, to some degree, be alleviated if these things were more widely known. All of us, whites and Negroes alike, must live together and work together, in harmony, striving toward the common goal of a more perfect social order. Morgan State College will do what it can, in honor, to promote this end.

I have stated so far my views concerning the objectives and program of Morgan State College. No one could question my right to discuss these views nor my desire to have them expressed in the future program of the institution.

THE PROBLEM OF RACIAL SEGREGATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

I turn now to a problem, a very urgent and important problem, the solution of which lies not within my province as the President of Morgan State College, but rather with the people of the State of Maryland. I refer to the problem of racial segregation in higher education.

I have deliberately refrained, despite many invitations to do so, and despite much provocation to do so, to participate in any public controversy or discussion concerning the place of Morgan State College in the total scheme of higher education in this state. I am an educator, not a politician. I conceive it as my appropriate function to administer the affairs of Morgan State College to the best of my ability, to provide for duly constituted state officials any advice they may request on problems of higher education and to present to the people of the state, in a legitimate fashion, the needs and program of the institution. I feel obligated to discuss this problem here, however, because of its

importance to the future development of Morgan State College and because expression of my personal views may contribute to its solution.

I knew very well at the time I accepted the presidency of this college that it is a segregated institution. So long as I am the president, it is my clear duty to operate the kind of institution the people of Maryland want, even though there be conflict with my personal views. It is my clear duty to attempt to develop at Morgan State College the very best educational program possible. These things I shall do, unless dishonorable conditions are imposed upon me.

My discussion of the future program of the college was based on the premise that it will serve directly a minority group. I hope that no one will interpret this view as any defense of racial segregation in education. I have always and I shall always be opposed to the pattern of racial segregation in American life.

I oppose segregation because I reject, as any self-respecting Negro must, the basic assumption underlying all phases of racial segregation, namely, that Negroes are inherently and inescapably inferior to other racial groups in our population. Whatever validity this assumption may have had, had surely been destroyed by scientific findings in psychology, sociology and anthropology during the past quarter century, as well as by the record of outstanding achievements of individual Negroes.

I oppose it because its practice deprives Negroes of occupational, educational and other civic benefits and has thus served both to depress the general level of accomplishment of the group and to deprive our society of the value of the accomplishment which might have been. True, we have produced an occasional Just in science, an occasional Anderson in the arts, an occasional Bunche in government; but how many more such persons would we produce, and how much richer our nation would be, if members of this racial group had full opportunity for development and expression.

I oppose it because its practice has weakened our nation's position of world leadership. We are witnessing today a world-wide conflict of opposing ideologies. Our every effort to promote democratic ideas is met with questions concerning our domestic

racial practices. Foreign commentators, almost without exception, point to our practices of racial segregation and discrimination as our greatest national weakness.

I oppose it because it is contrary to Christian ethics and inconsistent with the democratic principles on which our society is based.

I realize, of course, that this view is contrary to that held by many, possibly most, of the majority racial group in Maryland and that it is not in accord with the traditions of the state. These are facts which cannot be disregarded. As a psychologist, I know that a free people cannot be forced to change ingrained attitudes and behavior patterns overnight; but I also know that attitudes and practices can be modified, and that they sometimes change with startling rapidity.

The problem of making higher educational opportunities available to their Negro citizens is now challenging the attention of all the southern states and many of the northern states as well. A number of tentative solutions have been attempted and proposed. I believe that the question of racial segregation in higher education in this state must be approached in light of what is desirable and possible in Maryland, not what may be possible and desirable in Mississippi or in Massachusetts. I believe that the people of the Free State of Maryland are competent to make their own decision in this matter without following the leadership of those states which, by all objective measures, are the most backward in the nation.

I believe that the time has now come when Negro students can be freely admitted, and without restrictive qualifications, to every public institution of higher education in the state, just as they are now admitted to the Law School of the University of Maryland and to several of the distinguished private institutions within the state. I am convinced that, in this event, Morgan State College, if its program as an undergraduate college is adequately developed by the state, and under its own administration, will continue to attract the vast majority of the Negro college students of the state. These students, however, will no longer experience the sting and humiliation of enforced segregation, and the state will no longer need to be on the defensive concerning its provisions for the higher education of Negroes. And I

am certain that, "the walls of Jericho will not come tumbling down."

I realize that this view will be condemned both by those citizens who are adamant on the question of retaining present patterns of racial segregation in higher education and by those who demand that all vestiges of racial distinction be removed at once. This was ever the fate of compromise.

REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGING THE FUNCTION OF MORGAN STATE COLLEGE

I discussed with you, a while ago, my concept of the objectives of Morgan State College. I painted for you a dream, a vision of the Morgan that is in the process of becoming. Dreams do sometimes come true. And this one, too, can come true if the people of the state and the officials of the state believe in it as I do.

THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC

No state institution of higher education can prosper without the interest of the public and the active support of the people of the state. I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief in the doctrine that public institutions belong to the people; that their welfare is rightly a concern of the people; that they will be as strong as the people demand that they be; that an active interest in their programs is an obligation of the people of the state.

Morgan State College, then, solicits the active concern of the people of the state about its program. Particularly do we solicit the interest of the Negro people—the people of the Eastern Shore, the people of southern Maryland, the people of western Maryland, the people of the Baltimore area. Demand of us a high level of accomplishment, tell us of our shortcomings, send to us your talented sons and daughters, bring to us those problems we can help you to solve, invite us to your schools, your churches, your homes. Unless you do these things, we cannot be the kind of institution we want to be, or ought to be.

In this interest, though, remember that we are an educational institution. Do not demand of us those things we cannot in good conscience do. Morgan State College can never be an agency for propaganda, no matter how desirable that propaganda may seem; it can never be a center for agitation, nor an instrument for di-

rect social action; it can never engage in partisan politics. True, these will be no abridgment of the citizenship rights of students and teachers because of their connection with the institution. But the college itself must remain in a sense, aloof, a center for calm, objective, dispassionate inquiry.

We solicit, too, the cooperation of the white people of Maryland in our task here at Morgan State College. Particularly do we ask that you accept our products in the economic life of the state. Historically most of the graduates of colleges for Negroes have adopted teaching as a career. The teaching profession, however, can no longer absorb the rapidly increasing number of Negro college graduates, nor can it satisfy the increasingly diverse occupational interests of Negro students. We will produce good people in many fields. It is your moral responsibility, and in your own self-interest, to employ these people in your plants and industries as chemists and physicists, in your stores as salesmen and secretaries, in public utilities and in government in many fields. We are pathetically eager just to be given a chance, a chance to show our worth. Whether the products of this institution are to play their role as self-respecting, self-sustaining members of the community, or whether they are to constitute the core of an embittered and frustrated social group, ripe for foreign ideologies, will depend upon your willingness to give them this chance they so earnestly covet.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT

It is obvious that without the deep interest and generous support of the state government, a state institution cannot prosper. The chief responsibility of state officials is to assure that the institution receives sufficient funds to conduct its program—to assure the high values, tangible and intangible, which investment in higher education yields.

Morgan State College must have money for physical facilities. Although it has made considerable progress in this respect during the past two years, the college has never had the basic physical facilities which are required for first-class college work. Despite its position as the largest and strongest of the state institutions of higher education of Negroes, it has never had a gymnasium for promoting instruction in health and physical educa-

tion; it has never had an auditorium in which its students might assemble; its library collection and its scientific laboratories have always been substandard; its inadequate living accommodations for students and teachers have hindered its efforts to promote cultural values in the lives of its students. These deficiencies, which result from the historic fact that the state has not yet assumed its full obligation in the higher education of the Negro population, constitute a backlog of physical needs which must be remedied.

The college must have money for assembling a competent faculty and an adequate non-teaching staff to support the efforts of that faculty. While the institution has always had a number of strong teachers, only within the past few years has the college been able to attract to its campus a large number of young scholars of high promise. I am proud of the faculty we have. But to carry on our program, we must have a larger number of teachers; a larger number of mature teachers who have already established their worth in the fields of scholarship; a larger number of brilliant young teachers who give high promise of future development. We must have also an adequate non-teaching staff, librarians, technicians, secretaries, directors of dormitories and the many other workers necessary to support the work of the faculty. If we are to accomplish our task at Morgan State College a competent educational team comprised of teachers, administrators and staff, is essential.

The College must have money for scholarships. Our students are drawn from a clientele of low economic level. The steadily increasing cost of going to college has resulted in a virtual denial of opportunity for higher education to many talented and brilliant youth. The state has for many years provided direct scholarship aid to students in each of the other public institutions of higher education and to most of the private institutions as well. Morgan State College has never been included in these provisions. Here again the state government must become cognizant of the needs of the institution and of the population it serves.

Among the most striking findings of the recent survey of higher education in Maryland were that the state has not supported higher education from public funds as generously as most of the other states, and that Maryland perhaps lags behind all the other

southern states in its provisions for the higher education of Negroes. These facts explain why the needs of Morgan State College are so great. They justify a mighty effort on the part of the state now to bring this institution up to standard level.

I have described the kind of institution I think Morgan ought to be and how the people of the state and the officials of the state can participate in the program. We can develop at Morgan an institution not poorer in quality than the best public institution of higher education in this state. We have the vision, we have the faith, we have the ability, we have the determination to accomplish this task. We cannot, though, accomplish this task without your help. We shall soon know by manifestations of your interest, by indications of your support, if this is the kind of college you want Morgan State College to be.

A UNIVERSITY PROGRAM FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

W. J. KITCHEN

DIRECTOR, WORLD STUDENT SERVICE FUND

PEACE THROUGH UNDERSTANDING

PEACE through understanding is UNESCO's formulation of the major problem before the peoples of the world. World Student Service Fund invites American students and professors to join with their contemporaries in other countries in a serious approach to the problem of education for international understanding.

There is no quick answer in five easy lessons and we have no panacea to offer. But we believe that it is clearly the responsibility of the university community to make every effort to find the means by which to carry on the search for better ways of creating international understanding.

THE ROLE OF W.S.S.F.

The fabric of good will woven among students and professors around the world through more than a decade of material relief can provide a strategic support for enriched communication for international education. The relief enterprise has made us aware of the fact that our fellows in war-devastated countries are hungry and cold and sick, and often on the verge of despair. We have responded to the call to feed hungry bodies. This has helped to make us aware of the needs of hungry minds. We must become more aware of the fears and aspirations of our fellow students in other lands. We must find the means of thinking together with them about ways of life which have promise for the future. This must include educational, social, cultural, scientific and practical concerns. Political tensions, ideological conflicts and the cold war tend alarmingly toward world-wide conflict and mutual self-destruction. We must appeal to the binding and uniting power of the great universals—education, science, culture and religion.

Emergency material relief has not only met the personal distress of multitudes of needy students, it has also built a bridge of

communication. It has contributed to the survival of these young men and women. Furthermore, it has been a testimony of deep concern for the life of the university and of high regard for the strategic place of the university in the survival of those cultural values that seemed at stake in the struggle of the war.

Out of this stretching of hands across the sea a broader understanding has come to American students. A fabric of mutual good will and friendship has grown out of these years of relief and reconstruction. There is a deepened consciousness of our common lot as university men and women, as well as a growing sense of the more profound needs of the university community.

SEARCH FOR TRUTH IS CONDITION OF SURVIVAL

The emergency need has become less acute in some areas; in others it continues and will demand concern for a long time to come. But the job of fundamental educational reconstruction has hardly begun. Not only does the physical reconstruction remain to be done, but the upheaval and uncertainty of the times have raised basic questions about the role and function of the university in training leadership for social development. The conviction has grown deeper that the survival of humanity is at stake and that the university should be a strategic community in the struggle for survival.

A basic insecurity has settled upon us and the more robust minds and spirits have begun boldly to ask the leading question, What must we do to escape the destruction of another war and to assure a permanent peace with justice?

This question will not be answered by any one section of our world, though there are dogmatic ideological groups which profess to have the answer. Human survival is the common concern of all humanity. The true spirit of science, learning and religion leads us to search for truth wherever it may be found.

The university stands as the community which has been dedicated to the quest for truth. In its very nature the search must be universal. The relief enterprise has placed us in W.S.S.F. in a unique and strategic position to participate in this world-wide search for and communication of the values on which the new society can be constructed. Peace through understanding is basic in addition to the continued concern for the physical well-being

of students. This is the new role of W.S.S.F. as a part of the emerging world-wide community of university men and women.

These Things We Can Do And More

In Relief And Reconstruction

GIVE WITH GREATER UNDERSTANDING

It is an educational experience to be asked by a W.S.S.F. campaign solicitor to give money to the needs of fellow students in Europe and Asia. The reminder of our privileged economic position and the acute difficulties of our contemporaries should and does save us, as American students, from lethargic indifference and may save us from fatal isolation.

The subsistence story has been told well. Hundreds of thousands of students are hungry and cold and sick and on the verge of despair. Is it nothing to you? Does a dime or a dollar or ten dollars or a systematic life dedication represent your concern? This we have said to students. The challenge to answer is of the essence of education. The Fund Campaign when run with understanding is a basic educational situation. It calls for action and we learn by doing.

INFORMED INTERPRETERS

Now we must extend the area of understanding. We must enrich the communication from abroad back to us and give more of ourselves with our gift. We must enrich the training and the fund of knowledge available to all those who work as representatives and interpreters of W.S.S.F. This means more systematic preparation on the campus and in intercollegiate conferences. Training sessions take on educational significance in themselves and can be used as tools for international understanding as well as for training in fund raising.

Intercollegiate conferences on the student situation can be increased in number. Greater emphasis can be placed upon appreciation of the ways of thinking and the problems and aspirations of students in other countries. This represents an expanding program in W.S.S.F. In these activities we are assured of the support and collaboration of sponsoring organizations of W.S.S.F.

SPECIAL INTERESTS

Schools and colleges that have a special interest in a particular project or an individual institution abroad may call upon

W.S.S.F. for the kind of specific information and contacts needed to make the relationship a meaningful one for the American college and for the college abroad. The flow of communication both ways can be made much more significant. Concreteness and mutuality in this relationship are essential.

In International Education

CULTIVATE PERSONAL ACQUAINTANCE

Travel and study tours, carefully planned and conducted with proper interpretation, are exceedingly valuable. There is no substitute for face-to-face contacts.

Thousands of students now travel abroad each summer during the vacation period. Scores of organizations exist for the purpose of facilitating such travel. In this area N.S.A. is offering a valuable service. The Coordinating Committee for International Educational Enterprises seeks to relate these various organizations. A clearing house of information is maintained by the Institute of International Education at 2 West 45th Street, New York, New York.

W.S.S.F. is a participant in the efforts of the Coordinating Committee to make this phase of intercultural penetration as fruitful as possible in creating international understanding. The annual conference of the organization held in Atlantic City on December 1-3, 1949 was administered by W.S.S.F.

W.S.S.F.—I.S.S. STUDY TOURS

In addition to these cooperative relationships, W.S.S.F. conducts in collaboration with International Student Service in Geneva, a number of study tours. These study tours are planned around specific subjects for investigation and are accompanied by a competent educational interpreter. They offer increasingly excellent opportunities for meeting personally students and professors in various countries. Some of these tours are run on a "pilot project" basis in which pioneering work is undertaken; for example, a study of the relationships in the Middle East between the Jews and the Arabs. Information is available through W.S.S.F. field and national offices and applications for membership in tours are also accepted by these offices.

It is clearly the responsibility of study tour members to bring

back to the campus, and to disseminate as widely as possible to the student body, information and understanding gathered from such travel. Colleges having a special interest in individual projects and colleges abroad should use visits as a means of enriching the relationship.

SEMINARS AND TECHNICAL STUDY

A more intensive opportunity for personal contact is offered in seminar projects which bring students and professors together for a six week study program during the summer period.

In 1947, the Harvard Student Council, under the leadership of Clemens Heller and Richard Campbell, initiated the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies. Three summers of successful operation have established Salzburg as the leading postwar enterprise of its type in Europe. Its library on American Studies is regarded as the best in Europe.

The Midwest Seminar, sponsored by seven midwestern colleges, has completed its first summer of operation at Haslev in Denmark. The theme, Planning for Reconstruction, included both rural and urban phases of social planning. Professors and students were drawn from central and western Europe, Scandinavia, Britain and the United States.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Foreign Students Project has brought to this country for summer study at M.I.T., a number of selected students from many parts of Europe and some from Asia. In 1948 there were 64 students in the project and in 1949 the number had increased to 90. An extended study tour of industrial areas in the east was a feature of the 1949 program. The extent of W.S.S.F.'s contribution to this project has been confined to limited assistance in recruiting in Europe through I.S.S.*

Further projects of the seminar type will be developed in India and other parts of Asia.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Conferences are the best known and most far-reaching means of international intercommunication. The annual conference of

* In this connection should be mentioned: SPAN, American Studies at Yale University for Foreign Students and the Seminars conducted by the American Friends Service Committee, although these Seminars have not received special assistance from W.S.S.F.

I.S.S. is the most significant and representative international gathering through which W.S.S.F. works. The 22nd Annual Conference was entertained by W.S.S.F. at Wells College in the summer of 1949.

In addition to the Annual Conference of I.S.S., regional conferences are arranged during the year. These conferences frequently attack a specialized subject of current importance in student life. In April of 1949, a conference on student health problems was held at Haslev, Denmark in collaboration with the World Health Organization of the United Nations.

Such conferences when carefully planned and followed up are valuable not only for the international contacts which they provide but also in making an important contribution to the solution of the specific student problem around which the program is organized.

COOPERATION AMONG ORGANIZATIONS

It has become abundantly clear that the W.S.S.F. committee on the campus has a year-round job to perform. This will develop differently on different campuses. Many organizations are at work in the field of international relations. Every effort should be made to increase the effectiveness of these programs. Where nothing is being done, W.S.S.F. should see to it that something significant is undertaken.

ON THE CAMPUS

The W.S.S.F. committee should encourage the sponsoring organizations of W.S.S.F. to use their facilities for international education. Each of these organizations has a program of world relatedness which merits support.

The National Student Association program of international activities should be supported by all W.S.S.F. leaders. N.S.A. leaders likewise are available for full support of the fund-raising activities of W.S.S.F. This goes also for all of the sponsoring agencies of W.S.S.F.

The International Relations Clubs, which are related to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, are specialists in United Nations problems and other international affairs. Collaboration with them is important.

There are also numerous ways in which W.S.S.F. leaders can

collaborate with the American Friends Service college program of peace education. The Student YMCA & YWCA, the Protestant church student groups, Newman Clubs and Hillel Societies all have international programs in relation to which W.S.S.F. may at times offer a valuable service of information, correlation and consultation. Further reference to this function will be made in later program papers now in the process of preparation.

UTRECHT AND ESTES PARK

On the national level, the American Council on Education is mobilizing the interest of the colleges and universities in international education.

The international conference of universities held at Utrecht in the Netherlands, in the summer of 1948, looked toward a world organization of universities on the administrative level. The Estes Park conference called by the American Council on Education in June, 1949, was a follow-up of the Utrecht conference and has published a report, "The Role of Colleges and Universities in International Understanding," which is a major contribution to thinking in the area of the curriculum as well as in extra-curricular activities.

W.S.S.F. is a member of the American Council on Education and seeks to work in line with the trends being developed by this leading educational organization.

UNESCO

There are numerous ways in which UNESCO can and does contribute to international education on the campus. Its publications should be studied and utilized in the program. Educational reconstruction continues to be in the forefront of the UNESCO program. Dr. George N. Shuster, President of W.S.S.F., is Chairman of UNESCO's U. S. Committee on Relief and Reconstruction. Mr. W. J. Kitchen, Executive Secretary of W.S.S.F., is also a member of this committee.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICE

W.S.S.F. has been designated by I.S.S. as its responsible representative among the colleges in the United States. Likewise, I.S.S. constitutes the major international medium through which

W.S.S.F. is related to programs of international education abroad.

Reference to I.S.S. activities and publications is made continuously in the program of W.S.S.F.

THE RECONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE OF W.S.S.F.

The membership of this Committee, which is drawn from a wide range of experience, gives guidance to the policies and program of the educational reconstruction work of W.S.S.F. The purpose and scope of the committee is such that it is enabled to offer assistance on various levels of operation to a variety of types of student projects.

The 22nd Annual Conference of International Student Service, held at Wells College in the summer of 1949, was arranged on behalf of W.S.S.F. by the Reconstruction Committee. The study tours, the Salzburg and the Midwest Seminars have been assisted by the Committee. A seminar program for India is being projected for the summer of 1950. Further and systematic development of the program of international education on the campus is now the chief concern of the committee.

OUR GUEST STUDENTS FROM ABROAD

No program of international education could overlook the strategic possibilities offered by 25,000 students from abroad who are enrolled in American colleges.

There are those who have given special attention to ensuring fruitful relationships between these visiting students and their fellow college students, as well as with the American public. Among these should be mentioned The Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students, The National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, The American Friends Service Committee's Summer Seminars and the year-round program of peace education. These programs and others deserve the support and cooperation of W.S.S.F. leaders.

Each year W.S.S.F. makes available a number of foreign students for travel and visitation among the colleges. The interpretation of the physical conditions of students in war-devastated countries has been their first responsibility. However, these contacts and discussions have done far more. They have given to

American students a first-hand impression of how life looks to a contemporary from another university milieu. These young travelers may be pardoned if at times they have expressed views which are at variance with our own. Awareness of such differences offers a rich educational opportunity.

It is not the purpose of W.S.S.F. to compete with the work of any organization in this field of foreign student relations, and there is little danger that this will occur. All of us together have made a very small beginning of coming to know what these visitors among us really think about our American ways, and the way they themselves look at some of the crucial current problems, coming as they do from a completely different cultural background. Such discussion and understanding should be fostered by every means available through personal friendship and small informal discussions of a serious intellectual character. W.S.S.F. leaders should see that such mutually helpful contacts are arranged.

In addition, the D.P. students, who are being given placement in American colleges through W.S.S.F. as the administrative agent of the Coordinating Council for the Placement of D.P. Students, offer a special opportunity and responsibility as these newcomers to the United States look toward citizenship. The extension of the program of the International Refugee Organization for nine months beyond June, 1950 gives to us another opportunity to offer a chance for life to numberless D.P. students and scholars who would otherwise have no future. This is an urgent responsibility and a signal privilege.

In Publication and Research

I.S.S. PUBLICATIONS

In this area especially, I.S.S. has offered to the student world a unique service. *University* is a quarterly publication of I.S.S. It offers a forum for international discussion of current and perennial concerns of the university community.

The I.S.S. *News*, a monthly sheet, is a medium for more specific and transient items of international student concern.

These publications should be more widely circulated and read on American campuses.

THE W.S.S.F. NEWS

This is a monthly publication of contemporary material useful in relief campaigns and educational activities.

RESEARCH

Exchange of information may be a more descriptive term in this connection. There are, however, two areas in which W.S.S.F. is soliciting information for general distribution: the first is in successful programs on campuses for advancing international understanding; and the second is information regarding special interests which individual colleges have in particular colleges or projects abroad.

NOT EVERYTHING—BUT SOMETHING

The foregoing suggestions are made in all modesty and in the hope that they will, by their very inadequacy in relation to the problem, spur others to add their thinking and their doing.

All of us want to make some contribution to international understanding and world peace. These suggestions grow out of the experience of W.S.S.F. in ministering to the material needs of students. They make no claim to completeness nor profoundness of conception in relation to a philosophy of peace education. They grow out of an historical situation in which Jews, Catholics, Protestants and those with no formulated creed, have worked together in a common concern for the basic needs of their fellows. This in itself is an achievement and has been a significant experience. The insistent adherence to the principle of non-discrimination in relief distribution with need as the only criterion, is one of the few ways that seem to be open to us to bridge the gap between east and west. Material relief operations offer more hope of keeping open the doors of communication between east and west than does any other relationship.

This is our crucial problem. Either we keep open means of talking to each other across east-west boundaries or we eventually shoot it out with the tragic attendant consequences.

Efforts to understand each other and live together in peace are the stuff of survival. The contacts offered in W.S.S.F. are at hand. Let us make use of them and in doing so learn how better to do the job.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

GUY E. SNAVELY

THAT the presidential hazards are many and varied is indicated by the large annual turnover among our member presidents. According to the information obtained in our office there have been 67 changes in our membership during the current year. This is slightly over 10% of the total number.

Among those who have laid aside the presidential mantles are seven veterans who served nobly and well for more than twenty years. They have all erected abiding monuments on their campuses. Undoubtedly in their coming years of well-deserved leisure they will treasure most the friendship and records of the alumni who benefited by their influence. The following have given enthusiastic support to the work of the Association serving as presidents for periods indicated:

Howard E. Rondthaler, Salem College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina—40 years.

H. Orton Wiley, Pasadena College, Pasadena, California—39 years.

Charles E. Diehl, Southwestern, Memphis, Tennessee—32 years.

Samuel P. Duke, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia—30 years.

Charles J. Smith, Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia—29 years.

Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio—29 years.

Wiley Lin Hurie, College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas—26 years.

Hamilton Holt, Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida—24 years.

Edwin J. Heath, Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania—23 years.

The Commissions of the Association have been more or less active during the year. The Committee on Insurance and Annuities has been particularly active. It has had a joint meeting with the officers of the American Association of University Professors. The two groups have drawn up a joint statement con-

cerning retirement policies for college professors. This statement will be submitted by Chairman Ingraham for consideration and action at this meeting.

The Commission on Christian Higher Education has had several well-attended meetings in Washington and at Cincinnati. The report of their activities will be given at the Tuesday afternoon session of this Annual Meeting. Likewise, the Commission on Teacher Education has had meetings in Washington and Cincinnati, reports of which will be given by Chairman Whitehouse. Three members of the Commission on International Cultural Relations represented the Association at the Conference held at Estes Park, Colorado, June 19-22, on "The Role of Colleges and Universities in International Understanding."

The ever-present problem of college finances is receiving particular attention in various quarters. The Association of American Universities is making a detailed study of the problem. Later in our program will be given a report from the director of this project as well as a preliminary one from our new Commission on Colleges and Industry under the chairmanship of President Harold E. Stassen of the University of Pennsylvania.

According to the latest statistical information available for the current year, the number of students enrolled in state-supported institutions is just about equal to those enrolled in independent and church-supported colleges. Recent utterances of those in high places in the field of higher education indicate that state schools can look with confidence for sufficient support from their various governmental units. Some educators express considerable doubt about the future of the other type of college and university. Personally, I am optimistic.

The published records of the independent colleges and universities indicate eloquently that alumni and others have responded well to appeals for annual gifts. The church-supported colleges should, and many do, make their cases stronger with their constituencies. I know of one church college that receives \$65,000 annually from its supporting synod. I have read official reports that others have received around thirty and forty thousand dollars annually from their respective supporting conferences. The independent and church-related colleges must not, and will not, fall behind in the procession.

Since the Association of American Universities discontinued its policy of accrediting colleges and universities, there has developed a chaotic condition in the whole accrediting area. The American Council on Education, the regional accrediting associations and the National Commission on Accrediting launched at our Annual Meeting last year have had several joint conferences to discuss the problem. Further information on this matter will be given this morning by President Cloyd H. Marvin of George Washington University, representative of our Association and Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting.

A recent report from the U. S. Office of Education indicates that the college and university enrolment this fall is practically the same as it was a year ago. This is true in spite of the fact that there is quite a drop in the enrolment of veterans and among others in the freshman classes. It is noteworthy that the students in the upper classes have not dropped out in such large numbers as in recent years.

Striking is the record of one group of church-related colleges which shows that in 1948 the colleges affiliated with the United Lutheran Church increased 500% in enrolment from 1943 to 1948. As one would expect, they had a drop of about 6% in enrolment this year.

May I presume again to urge our member presidents to study carefully the implications involved in Federal Aid to Higher Education. I refer particularly to the proposal, now being pushed by the U. S. Office of Education and other educational leaders, that the federal government finance annually 400,000 scholarships for college students and 37,500 scholarships for graduate and professional students.

In the first place, an ambitious and needy student can still find ways and means to go through college. There are available many scholarships, work opportunities and large college loan funds, a great part of which are not now in use. With a liberal federal scholarship subsidy, young people will get the notion that we must have a real "welfare state" where the government will not only guarantee a college education but furnish suitable and good paying positions thereafter.

Seymour E. Harris, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, has given in a recent book and in several magazine arti-

cles a picture of the economic situation which indicates the unfortunate situation which would result from an oversupply of college graduates. While opposing a blanket subsidy for college students one could be sympathetic with the pending bill for a National Scientific Foundation which includes scholarship and fellowship opportunities for specific purposes for which there may be at present a notable deficiency in the number of trained leaders.

Another reason for opposition to Federal Aid is the inherent danger of federal control through a central office in Washington. Common sense and a knowledge of human nature affirm the old dictum that he who pays the piper calls the tune. Regulation of schools and colleges has ever been concomitant with dictatorships.

Thanks to our Board of Directors I had the past summer the rare and richly rewarding experience of a trip around the world with the Town Hall party. We visited thirteen national capitals besides making brief stops in several other countries. Obviously, my assignment was to confer with the leaders of education in higher institutions. I had a number of frank discussions and was greatly impressed by the advancement in college and university education in a number of the countries visited.

It was a pleasant surprise to see how much had been accomplished by the Germans in the establishment of the *Freie Universität* in the American sector in Berlin. Quite evident was the eagerness for higher education exhibited by the young men and women in the halls of this new university. It seemed to be going along unusually well in spite of lack of equipment and financial support.

The National University of Turkey in Ankara, like Fuad University in Cairo, has expanded during the past few years with magnificent new buildings and a large increase in student body. The most impressive edifice in the new nation of Israel is the Weizmann Institute in the suburbs of Tel Aviv. The faculty is unusually well trained: the buildings and equipment are up-to-date. With the beautifully landscaped campus one receives the impression of a modern high grade university.

In the two-year-old nation of Pakistan I met a wide-awake faculty in charge of the two year old University of Sind. I

found there a medical school with the finest appointments, built and equipped after the well-trained and energetic dean had made a tour of investigation to the leading medical schools in the United States and England. The University of Delhi in India is carrying on the fine reputation it has attained through the years.

In spite of the double dose of destruction by Japanese and American aviators on the University of the Philippines and Ateneo, the Jesuit University, I found these two institutions proceeding with the greatest optimism in rebuilding both of their universities in Quezon City in the suburbs of Manila. Likewise, the National University of Tokyo, formerly the Imperial University, is rising to meet the situation. While in Tokyo I was able to visit Mitaka, seventeen miles out of the city, and see the fine buildings, previously used for war purposes, turned over by the Japanese government to become the nucleus of a plant for the new Japan International Christian University.

In the question-period after my address to the students at the University of Sind, I had to plead guilty to the charge that our country is influenced too much by a materialistic spirit, although I thought that there was a certain amount of Pharisaicism on the part of the questioner who indicated that the Middle East excelled us greatly in the realm of spirituality. I received enthusiastic support from the university administration by calling attention to the great contribution to higher education in the Near and Middle East given by three American universities I had just visited at Beirut, Cairo and Istanbul.

The following representatives of member institutions have served as official delegates from the Association at the ceremonies indicated, frequently as speakers on the program:

Carlyle Campbell: Inauguration, President Harold L. Trigg, St. Augustine's College, January 14, 1949.

Guy E. Snavelly: Inauguration, James R. Killian, Jr., and Semi-Centennial, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, April 2.

Guy E. Snavelly: Bicentennial, Washington and Lee University, April 12.

Francis P. Gaines: Inauguration, President Walter S. Newman, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, April 18.

- T. S. Painter: Inauguration, President Wilson H. Elkins, Texas Western College, April 30.
- Guy E. Snavelly: Inauguration, President Hunter Guthrie, Georgetown University, May 1.
- Lincoln B. Hale: Inauguration, President D. W. Morris, Southern Illinois University, May 5.
- Robert L. Stearns: Inauguration, President William H. Gill, Colorado College, May 6.
- Guy E. Snavelly: Inauguration, President Otto F. Kraushaar, Goucher College, May 7.
- Harold G. Cooke: Inauguration, President D. M. Wiggins, Texas Technological College, May 10.
- John A. Hannah: Inauguration, President Ralph B. Draughon, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, May 12.
- William M. French: Inauguration, President David L. Crawford, Doane College, May 30.
- F. D. Bluford: Inauguration, President Alfonso Elder, North Carolina College at Durham, June 3.
- Thomas C. Donnelly: Inauguration, President Thomas L. Popejoy, University of New Mexico, June 4.
- Kenneth I. Brown: Inauguration, President Arthur S. Fleming, Ohio Wesleyan University, June 11.
- Watson Kirkconnell: National Conference of Canadian Universities, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada, June 14.
- M. Ellis Drake: Inauguration, President Juvenal Lalor, St. Bonaventure College, September 22.
- Robert L. Stearns: 75th Anniversary, Colorado School of Mines, September 29.
- Arthur H. Compton: Dedication of Science Building, Capital University, October 7.
- William W. Whitehouse: Inauguration, President John Scott Everton, Kalamazoo College, October 7.
- Arthur S. Flemming: Inauguration, President F. B. McIntosh, Ohio Northern University, October 9.
- Nelson V. Russell: Inauguration, President Will W. Orr, Westminster College, October 14.
- Rufus H. Fitzgerald: Inauguration, President William Bay Irvine, Marietta College, October 15.

James B. Conant: Inauguration, President Benjamin F. Wright, Smith College, October 19.

Kenneth I. Brown: Inauguration, President Clarence C. Stoughton, Wittenberg College, October 21.

Guy E. Snavelly: Inauguration, President A. Hollis Edens, Duke University, October 22.

Raymond S. Haupt: Inauguration, President David E. Weinland, Moravian College for Women, October 22.

J. Marcus Ellison: Inauguration, President Alonzo G. Moron, Hampton Institute, October 29.

Francis P. Gaines: Inauguration, President Boylston Green, University of the South, November 4.

Stephen W. Paine: Inauguration, President Miles Ellis Drake, Alfred University, November 10.

Robert L. Stearns: Inauguration, President Albert C. Jacobs, University of Denver, November 19.

Bessie Carter Randolph: Inauguration, President George Tyler Miller, Madison College, December 10.

Thirteen letters of a general nature have gone out from our office to the membership during this year.

During 1949 I have visited 59 campuses of member institutions and have spoken at three of them.

In conclusion, I desire to express gratitude to the fine and loyal support and cooperation given by the Board of Directors. I am particularly grateful to them for the vacation trip they arranged for me immediately after the last Annual Meeting. The good humor, fine spirit and constant and instant response to appeals for aid, particularly in completing the details of the program of the Annual Meeting, on the part of President Vincent J. Flynn, have been unusually valuable and stimulating in my year's work.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DURING the past year the Board of Directors has held four meetings: January 12 at the Hotel Commodore in New York, April 7 and November 22 in our Washington office, and January 9 at the Netherland Plaza Hotel in Cincinnati.

The principal topics discussed at the Board meetings included accrediting, financing colleges, social security, student health and accident insurance and public relations.

The Board sponsored two regional meetings, one in Omaha, Nebraska, on December 3, and the other in Houston, Texas, on November 28. President Flynn was Chairman of the Omaha Conference and prepared its program. Executive Secretary Robert N. DuBose of the Commission on Christian Higher Education also spoke at that Conference. The Executive Director spoke at the second regional conference which was intended primarily for the church-related colleges of the South and was held in connection with the annual meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

At its last annual meeting the American College Public Relations Association voted to establish a central office with headquarters in Washington. It is desired to establish this office in connection with our office with the understanding that our Association will help raise a considerable portion of the funds necessary for the maintenance of the office. The Board of Directors gave unanimous approval to this proposal.

The new National Commission on Accrediting explained in the Executive Director's report held a meeting in Chicago on May 3 at which were present our two official representatives, President Cloyd H. Marvin of George Washington University and the Executive Director. At this meeting it was voted to ask each of the five cooperating national associations to appoint six representatives with power to proceed with organization and action. The Board has appointed the following:

President Arthur G. Coons, Occidental College

President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas

President Theodore H. Jack, Randolph-Macon Woman's College

President Cloyd H. Marvin, George Washington University

President Samuel S. Stratton, Middlebury College

Executive Director Guy E. Snavely

The following institutions are recommended for membership in the Association:

College of Education and Industrial Arts (Ohio)

Idaho State College

LeMoyne College (Tennessee)

Mount Saint Agnes College (Maryland)

Newark College of Engineering (New Jersey)

St. Mary's Dominican College (Louisiana)

St. Norbert College (Wisconsin)

Texas State University for Negroes

University of Alaska

Some other applications for membership have been received but will not be considered until official reports have come that they have been accredited by their respective regional associations.

REPORT OF TREASURER

LEROY E. KIMBALL

VICE CHANCELLOR, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

SCHEDULE A

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

January 1, 1949 to December 31, 1949

Cash balance, January 1, 1949 \$ 47,822.55

Receipts:

Membership dues:

Years 1947 and 1948 \$ 160.00
Year 1949 47,665.00
Year 1950, in advance 150.00

Total dues \$47,975.00

BULLETIN and reprints 3,969.65

Music and other art books 134.02

"Comprehensive Examinations" 80.56

Interest 631.28

Refund of advances 53.94

For American College Public Relations

Association 1,200.00

Transfer from Circulating Library of

Choral Music 1,768.54

Total Receipts 55,812.99

\$103,635.54

Disbursements:

Allocation of membership dues to:

Commission on Christian Higher Education \$ 9,660.00

Arts Program 6,440.00

Appropriation to Commission on Christian

Higher Education 1,000.00

Administrative expenses:

Salaries and annuities 18,564.96

Rent 2,876.00

Office expenses 1,426.88

Office equipment 38.00

Travel 5,173.30

Auditing 100.00

Committees and Commissions 1,993.80

American Council on Education 100.00

Annual Meeting Expenses 1,758.23

Regional Conferences 399.62

BULLETIN and reprint expenses 6,263.59

Total Disbursements 55,794.38

Balance, December 31, 1949 \$ 47,841.16

Report of Treasurer

139

SCHEDULE B

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

SPECIAL PROJECTS

January 1, 1949 to December 31, 1949

Arts Program

Balance, January 1, 1949	\$18,689.86
Receipts	37,558.81

Disbursements	\$56,248.67
	36,754.16

Balance, December 31, 1949	\$19,494.51
----------------------------------	-------------

Circulating Library of Choral Music

Balance, January 1, 1949	\$ 1,768.54
Transferred to General Fund	1,768.54

Balance, December 31, 1949	\$ 00.00
----------------------------------	----------

Commission on Christian Higher Education

Balance, January 1, 1949	\$ 4,703.45
Receipts	12,685.00

Disbursements	\$17,388.45
	13,651.62

Balance, December 31, 1949	\$ 3,736.83
----------------------------------	-------------

Commission on International Cultural Relations

Balance, January 1, 1949	\$ 1,324.55
Disbursements	191.18

Balance, December 31, 1949	\$ 1,133.37
----------------------------------	-------------

SCHEDULE C

STATEMENT OF CASH BALANCES

December 31, 1949

Funds

General Fund	\$47,841.16
Arts Program	19,494.51
Commission on Christian Higher Education	3,736.83
Commission on International Cultural Relations	1,133.37

Total	\$72,205.87
-------------	-------------

Composed of Balances in

Bowery Savings Bank	\$ 8,149.08
Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank	9,282.70
Franklin Savings Bank	7,971.73
Guaranty Trust Company of New York	3,158.99
Union Dime Savings Bank	15,201.05
Union Trust Company of the District of Columbia	15,702.72
West Side Savings Bank	12,714.60
Cash on hand	25.00

Total (as above)	\$72,205.87
------------------------	-------------

SCHEDULE D**BALANCE SHEET***December 31, 1949***Assets**

Cash in banks and on hand	\$72,205.87
Choral music at book value	9,300.00
Deposit with American Air Lines	425.00
Total	\$81,930.87

Funds

General Fund	\$48,266.16
Arts Program	19,494.51
Commission on Christian Higher Education	3,736.83
Commission on International Cultural Relations	1,133.37
Circulating Library of Choral Music	9,300.00
Total (as above)	\$81,930.87

Statement of Income and Expenditures for 1948, 1949 as Compared with 1950 Budget

<i>Income</i>	<i>1948</i>	<i>1949</i>	<i>Budget 1950</i>
Membership Dues	\$47,950.00	\$47,975.00	\$48,900.00
BULLETIN and Reprints	3,963.85	3,969.65	3,600.00
Comprehensive Examinations	107.17	80.56	50.00
Music and other books	184.74	134.02	50.00
Miscellaneous: Interest	455.99	631.28	600.00
Other	272.73	3,022.48
Total	\$52,934.48	\$55,812.99	\$53,200.00
<i>Expenditures</i>			
Annual Meeting	\$ 1,185.73	\$ 1,758.23	\$ 1,900.00
Membership Fees	100.00	100.00	125.00
Committees and Commissions	4,116.79	1,993.80	2,000.00
BULLETIN and Reprints	6,141.54	6,263.59	6,300.00
Regional Conferences	382.07	399.62	800.00
Rent	2,126.50	2,876.00	2,652.00
Office Expense	2,530.59	1,426.88	2,000.00
Office Equipment	2,066.00	38.00	500.00
Auditing	75.00	100.00	100.00
Travel	581.84	5,173.30	1,200.00
Salaries and Annuities	16,971.98	18,564.96	19,100.00
Contingencies	100.00
Advances	53.94
Allocations—CCHE	12,735.00	9,660.00	9,780.00
“ Arts Program	6,380.00	6,440.00	6,520.00
Appropriation—CCHE	1,000.00
Total	\$55,446.98	\$55,794.38	\$53,077.00
Balance on Current Operations	18.61	123.00
Deficit on Current Operations trans- ferred from Reserves	\$ 2,512.50

Tait, Weller & Baker
Certified Public Accountants
Philadelphia—New York

We certify that in our opinion the foregoing statements of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1949, properly present the transactions as reflected by the books and records of the ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) TAIT, WELLER & BAKER
Certified Public Accountants

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

R. H. FITZGERALD

CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

LAST year it was suggested that we attempt to schedule three engagements a week for our Concert Artists, add several new ones to our list, and announce all these musicians in larger areas. These recommendations have been endorsed by an increase in the number of requests for Concert Artists this year. Seventy-two engagements were established as compared with 33 during 1948-49. The new artists are:

Louis Kaufman, Violinist
Robert Rounseville, Tenor
Konrad Wolff, Pianist
The Juilliard String Quartet
The University of Alabama String Quartet

Our list of Faculty Visitors has also been enlarged. We added:

Giovanni Bagarotti, Violinist
Richard Chase, Folklorist
Louis Crowder, Pianist
John W. Oliver, Professor of History
Arthur S. Siegel, Photographer and Designer
John Walley, Artist and Designer

The inclusion of a Visitor in the field of photography was an experiment but the response leads us to explore the possibility of increasing offers in this field. Seven colleges asked for a visit by Mr. Siegel and he was able to accommodate all.

At the request of the Commission on Christian Higher Education, we prepared proposals for visits by seven religious leaders who are available in the spring of 1950. Since the information was mailed within the past few weeks, there has not been sufficient time to judge the demand. We hope to include these speakers in our Arts Program Booklet for 1950-51. President Kenneth I. Brown of Denison University is chairman of the committee on selections.

We are happy to report continued interest in the color reproduction project started two years ago. The Grand Central Art

Galleries informs us that more and more colleges are taking advantage of the plan, and that several institutions have re-ordered.

The number of requests for visits this year is slightly ahead of last year. It is not possible to accommodate all the colleges from which requests are received. Our Faculty Visitors, in most cases, can accept only four engagements. The excess invitations are placed on a waiting list and efforts are made to fulfill them the next season. Prior commitments and numerous campus activities often prevent colleges from accepting dates we attempt to establish for our Concert Artists. We are trying to meet this difficulty by mailing our announcements in April.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

ROBERT N. DUBOSE

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

THROUGHOUT the entire year, the Executive Secretary has endeavored to keep the members of the Association of American Colleges and the associate members of the Commission on Christian Higher Education informed concerning its current program and projective plans through the media of the *BULLETIN* and *COLLEGE AND CHURCH*. For that reason, in most instances, this report will necessarily be a summary of reports given either to the membership at large or to the Administrative Board at its meetings during the year.

The Executive Secretary has made every possible effort to keep constantly in mind that this is an agency within the Association of American Colleges and that through it the various colleges and universities may unite for their common interests to give emphasis to the fundamental place of religion in education, especially at the college level, in the promotion of a Christian philosophy of life, in the development of Christian character in the individual and in the establishment of a Christian social order. We have given primary emphasis to our fundamental purpose, which is, of course, to point out and stress, in all suitable ways, the vital place which the church-related college and university holds in American education as well as the importance of having such institutions free from the control of the state. Through regional and state conferences, through publications and through public relations, the Commission has encouraged cooperation and coordination within the group of colleges and universities fostering religion in education. It has projected its interests into other related fields through cooperating with established church agencies and institutions. It has participated, insofar as practicable, in the activities of interfaith and interdenominational groups. And always, it has sought to make available the results of practical sociological investigations and studies made by colleges and universities and other institutions concerned with basic moral and ethical values.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

The Commission is seeking to crystallize the natural historical development of its program through the four standing divisional committees for which the By-Laws provide specific responsibilities. Following is a brief report on their activities for 1949.

Committee on Conferences and Programs

President Hunter B. Blakely, Queens College, has served as chairman of this Committee with the following members of the Administrative Board: Dr. John O. Gross, Secretary, Board of Education of the Methodist Church; President Levering J. Tyson, Muhlenberg College. During the year three regional conferences have been held under the auspices of this Commission. That the members of this Association may have a concrete picture of the over-all activities in these conferences, I would like to summarize here programs presented at their annual meetings. Even a casual observation of the following resumes will show the wide scope of interest and the distinctive characteristics of each conference.

(1) The Fourteenth Annual Conference of Church-Related Colleges of the Southeast was held at the Rice Hotel, Houston, Texas on November 28, 1949. The theme of that Conference was "How Can the Church Colleges of the South Organize for More Effective Cooperation and Service?" (To your Secretary's knowledge this is the first time that a regional conference of the Commission has been held in connection with the annual meeting of an area accrediting agency. This plan was well received and the Conference has voted to continue such a practice.) The visiting speaker was Dr. E. Fay Campbell, Division of Higher Education, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., who gave an address on "The Place of the Church College in American Life Today and Tomorrow." (See Winter issue, *College and Church*.)

Members of the area participating were Dean Jerome A. Moore, Texas Christian University, who brought to the Conference a message of welcome to Texas and a brief story of the Texas Council of Church-Related Colleges; and Dr. John L. Plyler who discussed with the group, "What I Would Like to See the Church-Related Colleges in the South Attempt for the Future." Dr.

Guy E. Snively, Executive Director of the Association of American Colleges, represented the Association and the Commission and addressed the group on Christian higher education in the Association of American Colleges. Dr. Hunter B. Blakely, Queens College, served as chairman of the Executive Committee composed of the following members: President Luther L. Gobbel, Greensboro College; President John L. Plyler, Furman University; Dr. F. S. Ranking, King College; and Dr. J. I. Riddle, Judson College. Robert N. DuBose, Executive Secretary, Commission on Christian Higher Education, is an ex officio member of the Executive Committee.

The officers for the coming year are: President, Provost Charles J. Smith, Roanoke College; Vice President, President Boylston Green, University of the South; Secretary, President Luther L. Gobbel, Greensboro College; and Treasurer, President M. E. Sadler, Texas Christian University. The Southeast Conference decided that in the future this regional conference would be known as the Conference of the Church-Related Colleges of the South and charged the Executive Committee with the responsibility of arranging for its 1950 meeting at Richmond, where it is hoped that the Conference may be well represented in the city's pulpits on the Sunday morning of its convention, with an evening mass meeting inspiring presenting the cause of Christian education to the people of the city. The business session of the Conference will be held on the following day.

(2) The Annual Conference of the Church-Related Colleges of the West Central Area was held December 3, 1949 in Omaha, Nebraska. This Conference used for its theme, "The Future of the Church-Related College." The morning program consisted of two addresses on the financial future of the church-related college. The first address was given by John B. Goodwin, Controller, Creighton University, who presented an analysis of the financial situation today as related to the support of benevolent enterprises, particularly private as well as church-related colleges. Rupert Hawk, Director of Accounts, Grinnell College, spoke directly concerning the financial situation. He spoke of the needs as well as the method of creating friends and contributors to our church colleges. Dean Wilhelmus B. Bryan, Macales-

ter College, reported on Elmo Roper's *Fortune* Magazine Survey, "Higher Education." In the afternoon session, President Nelson P. Horn, Baker University, addressed the Conference on "Making the Church College Christian." He discussed the methods of training for Christian living both on the campus and by those who go out from our church colleges. General discussion followed his address. Robert N. DuBose, Executive Secretary of the Commission, presented a paper evaluating the state of the Christian college and its work.

The highlight of the meeting was a discussion period in which members of the Conference freely participated. For a number of years, the West Central Regional Conference has featured freedom of expression and exchange of ideas from the floor and this practice has effectively contributed to the success of the program by transforming the meeting into a fellowship.

President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas, served as chairman of the Conference. The following officers were elected to serve for the year 1950: President Russell D. Cole, Cornell College, Chairman; President George F. McDougall, Huron College, Vice Chairman; and President M. Earle Collins, Tarkio College, Secretary.

(3) The Texas Council of Church-Related Colleges is regional because the neighboring states, especially Arkansas and Oklahoma, have been invited to participate in its annual program while the members of this group are also included in the Southeast Regional Conference, nevertheless they retain the intimacy of a state-wide organization. The Tenth Annual Meeting of this Council was held on November 22-23 at Abilene. Hosts for the Conference were Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene Christian College and McMurry College. The program was built around the theme "Current Problems in Christian Higher Education." On the program for the first morning of the Conference were meetings of commissions. Dr. Bruce Thomas, Trinity University, led a panel discussion on "Educational Objectives of the Christian College" which was presented in four categories: In the Social Sciences, in the Humanities, in the Natural Sciences, and in Professional Schools Related to Universities. At each annual session of this Conference one of the denominations presents, as

a part of the program, a paper on its contribution to education in Texas. Pursuant to this practice, Dr. Colby D. Hall, Brite College of the Bible, Texas Christian University, had as his topic, "The Contribution of the Disciples of Christ to Education in Texas." A most interesting panel discussion on "Campus Religious Activities" was led by Dr. Paul J. Schwab, Trinity University.

President John L. McMahon, Our Lady of the Lake College, led a panel on "Meeting Current Problems in Christian Higher Education." President Don H. Morris, Abilene Christian College, spoke on "Federal aid to Education," and Dean W. T. Walton, Hardin-Simmons University, discussed "Effects of the Gilmer-Aiken Legislation." President Harold G. Cooke, McMurry College, discussed "Fund Raising" and President W. B. Guerrant, Austin College, discussed "Making the Church-Related College Distinctly Christian." Dean Jerome Moore of Texas Christian University is the retiring president.

State Conferences

There are at present 12 organized state councils of Christian colleges with which this Commission cooperates. It is assisting in the organizing of state councils of Christian colleges in three additional states. More and more the Commission is entering into the program of the general college association in states where there is no specific organization for Christian colleges. For example, Dr. Ralph W. Lloyd represented the Commission at the Tennessee Council of Colleges and spoke briefly on Christianity in higher education. It is felt that this Commission can work more effectively through the existing educational councils until such time as a state Christian college organization becomes essential. The Kentucky Association of Church-Related Colleges and the Council of Church-Related Colleges of North Carolina are cases in point. (See *College and Church*, Vol. XIV, No. 4, pp. 36, 38.) We sincerely hope that all state conferences will report their proceedings to this Commission for publicity through *College and Church* in order that they may share their experiences. The National Office is anxious to cooperate in any way possible with all such groups.

Committee on Publications

COLLEGE AND CHURCH, the quarterly publication of this Commission, has endeavored to keep before the colleges and universities the pertinent issues of the day in the field of Christian higher education. In order to present more widely varied articles and to focus on all facets of thought, it provides for complete freedom of discussion concerning the different issues affecting Christian higher education. The magazine is still in the process of development and suggestions for further improvement would be greatly appreciated. We welcome manuscripts for consideration by the editor.

COLLEGE AND CHURCH is mailed to the 644 members of the Association of American Colleges, to the 86 associate members of this Commission, to the Executive Secretary of the Board of Education of the various denominations, to the National Protestant Council on Higher Education and to the National Catholic Educational Association, and in the interest of Christian higher education and its public relations program, 273 copies of each issue are mailed to newspaper agencies, editors of magazines, directors of radio research programs, and other agencies having a vital concern for the issues we represent. In addition to these, COLLEGE AND CHURCH has a paid subscription list composed of members of Boards of Trustees, libraries and others interested in the publication. It is hoped that many more of our colleges will avail themselves of extra copies of the periodical for judicious distribution.

An attractive handbook of the Commission on Christian Higher Education has recently been prepared by the Commission. This handbook, available upon request, will be used in public relations, in answer to many queries about the Commission and in the Commission's contact with prospective associate members.

The By-Laws of the Commission have been attractively bound for use by the Commission and are also available.

Committee on Public Relations

The following tentative outline of public relations activities, emphasizing six areas of the Commission's responsibility, has been prepared by the Committee on Public Relations composed

of Presidents Ralph W. Lloyd, John A. Flynn and Dale H. Moore.

This report on policy recommends the development of close relationships between the Commission and the National Protestant Council, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Federal Council of Churches and other national educational organizations. It also makes provision for regular exchange of information and suggestions with the church agencies and officers responsible for higher education.

In the area of legislation, the Commission is given the responsibility for representing Christian higher education whenever necessary. In this regard, the Commission should cooperate with, and use and supplement the services of, other bodies active in this field in securing and distributing information.

The Commission's program of information will be through COLLEGE AND CHURCH, the BULLETIN, leaflets and brochures, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, AMERICA and other Protestant and Catholic publications, through secular magazines (when the Commission should seek to develop the interest of magazines in articles and encourage writers of prominence to offer articles), through the press (through a schedule of releases on matters in the Commission's sphere which might be of national interest), through the radio and in the promotion of books (when a current book commends itself to the Commission every effort should be made to increase its influence).

The Commission's public relations policy recommends the extension of its service through regional and state groups, by presenting the Commission's cause in these meetings. The Committee recommended the scheduling of church college meetings in connection with annual meetings of the regional accrediting bodies.

In regard to *aid to the individual college* the report suggests the following: (1) by the general material in publications and other literature; (2) by representing member colleges in national matters; (3) by providing through COLLEGE AND CHURCH and otherwise, concrete suggestions as to the institution's public relations program. This should include reporting of successful activities of varied types of member colleges; (4) by visits of the Executive Secretary and officers; (5) by making available

prominent visiting speakers on religion through the Arts Program; and (6) by inviting correspondence with the Commission's office and officers.

Cooperative Project with Religious Speakers through the Arts Program

President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University, has served as chairman of the project for religious speakers through the Arts Program. The following men, upon the invitation of Dr. Guy E. Snavelly, have consented to participate in the program of two-day visits to the college campuses: President George H. Armacost, University of Redlands; Dr. M. S. Davage, Board of Education, Methodist Church; Mr. Frank Grebe, Associate Minister, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; Dr. John O. Gross, Board of Education, Methodist Church; President Richard I. McKinney, Storer College; President Raymond F. McLain, Transylvania College; President R. B. Montgomery, The College of the Bible, and President Clarence C. Stoughton, Wittenberg College.

Arrangements for these visits are being made through the Arts Program and publicity for this program is being given by the Commission on the Arts and by the Commission on Christian Higher Education. President Brown will continue to serve as Chairman of this project through 1950. It is hoped that the program will be well received and that these speakers will be used effectively on many of our college campuses.

Participation of Associate Members in the Arts Program

The Association of American Colleges has kindly consented to the use of the Arts Program by the associate membership of the Commission on Christian Higher Education. For further information regarding this project you are asked to consult Miss Norwood Baker, Assistant Director, Commission on the Arts, Association of American Colleges, 19 West 44th Street, New York 18, New York or the office of the Commission on Christian Higher Education, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Membership

The 644 members of the Association of American Colleges hold full membership in the Commission on Christian Higher Education. In addition, there are 86 associate members under Article II, Section 2 of the By-Laws.

Of 37 applications for associate membership received in 1949, the following 31 were accepted:

Athens College, Ala.; Brevard College, N. C.; Bloomfield College and Seminary, N. J.; Canterbury College, Ind.; Centenary Junior College, N. J.; Christian College, Mo.; College of Notre Dame, Calif.; David Lipscomb College, Tenn.; Edward Waters College, Fla.; Endicott Junior College, Mass.; Freed-Hardeman College, Tenn.; George Fox College, Ore.; Green Mountain Junior College, Vermont; Hiwassee College, Tenn.; Lees Junior College, Ky.; LeMoyne College, N. Y.; Luther College, Neb.; Marian College, N. Y.; Merrimack College, Mass.; Olivet Nazarene College, Ill.; Ricks College, Idaho; Sacred Heart College, Kan.; St. Catharine Junior College, Ky.; Shorter College, Ark.; Sinclair College, Ohio; Snead Junior College, Ala.; Spartanburg Junior College, S. C.; Stillman College, Ala.; Wesley College, N. D.; Wood Junior College, Miss.; and Worcester Junior College, Mass.

Annual Meeting

The Commission on Christian Higher Education was in charge of the session on Tuesday afternoon, January 10, at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges. The Executive Secretary in cooperation with Dr. Raymond F. McLain, Chairman of the Commission, Dr. Kenneth I. Brown, Chairman of the Committee for religious speakers in the Arts Program, and the chairmen of the divisional committees presented the annual report of this Commission.

Following this report the Conference considered: "Lessons for American Higher Education: (a) From Contemporary Europe, (b) From Contemporary Asia." President Conrad Bergendoff, Augustana College, a member of the Administrative Board, discussed the first part. Dr. Ruth Seabury, Secretary of Education, American Board of Missions, Congregational Church, presented the second part of the theme. A panel dis-

cussion chaired by President Raymond F. McLain followed. Participants in the discussion were: President Ralph W. Lloyd, Maryville College; President F. H. Black, Robert College; and The Reverend Edward B. Rooney, S.J., Jesuit Educational Association.

The Administrative Board

The Administrative Board of this Commission met four times during the year—January (New York), March (Washington, D. C.), November (Washington, D. C.), and January (Cincinnati). Each meeting was excellently attended.

The following members of the Administrative Board have completed their three year term: President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University; President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; Dr. John O. Gross, Board of Education of the Methodist Church; President Levering Tyson, Muhlenberg College; and President Ralph W. Lloyd, Maryville College.

The new members of the Administrative Board elected at the annual meeting in January are: President Katherine G. Blyley, Keuka College; President Edwin E. Voigt, Simpson College; President Howard F. Lowry, College of Wooster; President Clyde A. Milner, Guilford College; and President Comerford O'Malley, De Paul University. In addition to these, President Robert J. Slavin, Providence College, was appointed to replace William J. Millor, who at present is not serving in an executive capacity.

The Executive Secretary

The Executive Secretary is making an extensive study of the national student religious organizations and will report his findings at the appropriate time in COLLEGE AND CHURCH.

From time to time the Executive Secretary has assisted capable Christian men, prepared for administrator and professor duties, in finding placement with Christian colleges. Likewise, he has assisted colleges in their search for academically and spiritually qualified personnel.

The Executive Secretary is also in contact with Radio Church Associates with regard to the availability at cost to college campuses of a series of devotional transcriptions for use in the religious activities program.

He is cooperating with a current survey of college and university courses designed to prepare students for more successful marriages.

During the year, the Executive Secretary attended numerous meetings in the interest of the Association of American Colleges and has represented the Commission at meetings held throughout the country.

During the summer months, the Executive Secretary intermittently substituted for the Chaplain of the United States Senate in opening the official deliberations of that body.

Financial Report

The auditor's report which will be found in the March issue of the ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES BULLETIN reveals only partially the generosity of the Association of American Colleges in its relationships with the Commission. The Executive Secretary expresses his gratitude to the Association of American Colleges, its Board of Directors and to Dr. Guy E. Snavelly for providing many vital opportunities for service that would have been otherwise unavailable.

* * *

The Executive Secretary wishes to express his sincere appreciation to all those whose cooperation has made possible this report. To those who assumed responsibilities for the regional and state conferences; to those who contributed to the development and expansion of COLLEGE AND CHURCH; to those who contributed to the success of the entire program through participation in the various projects; to Chairman Raymond F. McLain and the entire Administrative Board for its kind considerations and wise counsel; to Dr. Guy E. Snavelly and to the staff of the Association of American Colleges for their constant willingness to share the burden of our common objective, and to all others who in any way gave impetus to this important work, the Executive Secretary is grateful.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

BEN M. CHERRINGTON

DIRECTOR, SOCIAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

ATTENTION is called to the presence in the United States of several score distinguished Chinese scholars. It is recommended that member institutions of this Association seriously consider the possibility of offering a position as a lecturer or research worker to one or more of these displaced scholars. The government of the United States has appropriated funds to assist Chinese students engaged in study in this country but it appears that the appropriation does not apply to the group of Chinese scholars just alluded to. It is recommended, therefore, that the Board of Directors be requested to urge the Federal Government to provide assistance to displaced Chinese scholars who have completed their academic studies as well as to Chinese students enrolled in American institutions of learning.

At the annual meeting of this Association one year ago in New York City, it was recommended that this Association join with other national organizations in higher education in a conference to explore the responsibility of colleges and universities in international affairs. The conference was sponsored by the American Council on Education with the cooperation of this Association and sixty-eight other national bodies concerned with higher education. It convened in Estes Park, Colorado, June 19-22, 1949. This Association was represented by three official delegates appointed by the Board of Directors, President Vincent J. Flynn, President Francis S. Hutchins and Director Ben M. Cherrington. Work papers covering the major aspects of interests of colleges and universities in international affairs had been prepared in advance by specialists. Representatives of the national government and of the United Nations were present to assist in the deliberations. Effort was made to produce findings that would be of practical assistance to faculty members and administrators in the improvement of the programs upon the local campus in the field of international education and other international activities.

The important recommendations and suggestions from the conference have been published by the American Council on Education in *The Role of Colleges and Universities in International Understanding* which sells for \$1.00. Your Commission suggests that local institutions will find this report a stimulating and usable document, and it recommends that each institution place copies in the hands of appropriate officers and chairmen of committees dealing with curriculum and policy matters. Upon two specific recommendations emanating from the Estes Park Conference, it is suggested that this Association take action. Therefore, your Commission recommends:

- a. That the Association of American Colleges give full support to the establishment of a world association of universities and colleges as proposed by the Utrecht Conference of 1948.
- b. That the Association of American Colleges approve the establishment of a National Commission to unify and facilitate the interests of higher education in international affairs and that such a National Commission be provided with a competent professional staff to represent them.

It is the judgment of your Commission that it is inadvisable to establish a new and autonomous organization, and therefore it suggests that the national commission when established should be associated with an existing organization which broadly embraces the higher educational institutions of the country, such as, the American Council on Education, Institute of International Education or possibly the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Your Commission suggests that the Board of Directors of this Association assist in the creation of the proposed commission.

It will be recalled that your Commission has repeatedly called attention to the fundamental difference between the government's unilateral information program abroad and its bilateral and multilateral cultural relations program. The latter activity which is based upon mutuality of interests on the part of peoples in this country and abroad is appropriately turning to the colleges and universities of America for increasing participation. At the time of the meeting of this Association in Cincinnati two years ago, there was before the Senate a bill known as the Mundt

Bill which had passed the House of Representatives. As the Bill stood, it would have combined the unilateral information activities and the reciprocal international cultural activities of the Department of State in one office. The matter was discussed in a plenary session of this Association for one hour, at the conclusion of which a resolution was unanimously passed calling upon Congress to amend the Mundt Bill in such a way as to provide for the complete separation of the informational activities and the reciprocal cultural activities in the Department of State. Fortified with this resolution and with the cooperation of many other interested individuals, Dr. Snively was instrumental in securing an amendment to the Bill in the United States Senate. This amendment defines the function of Information activities on the one hand and Cultural activities (described as Educational Exchange activities) on the other and calls for the creation of two separate offices for the administration of these two functions in the Department of State. However, the amended Bill as finally carried does not provide for complete divorcement from top to bottom of these two functions, therefore, your Commission proposes the following:

WHEREAS this Association meeting in Cincinnati in January 1948 unanimously recommended that the Congress of the U.S. provide for separate organization and administration of the Department of State's information and educational exchange services; and whereas the Smith-Mundt Act only partly recognizes this principle by providing for an office of information and an office of educational exchange but places both under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; therefore be it

Resolved: that this Association re-affirm its conviction that for full effectiveness these two functions should be completely separated;

That pending the complete separation of these functions the Secretary of State be urged to make every effort to see that international educational exchange services shall be given support equal to that afforded informational activities.

The Smith-Mundt Act provides for a Commission of five citizens to advise on our government's policy and program in information and a separate Commission of five civilians to advise on the activities of the Office of Educational Exchange. The Act also requires that wherever existing private organizations or in-

stitutions are competent to carry on the program envisaged by the Act such organizations or institutions should be employed in preference to the government's operation of the program. The Act further provides that the Secretary of State may make grants of money to state and local units of government and private organizations in carrying out the proposals of the Act. The participation of this government in the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization is authorized by separate legislation (Public Law 565) which establishes the National Commission of one hundred members for UNESCO. To date the budget and activities of the National Commission for UNESCO, while located in the Department of State, have been conducted with little if any reference to the budget and activities of the Office of Educational Exchange, likewise located in the Department of State. During the past two years as the programs of these two bodies have begun to take shape, it is evident that many of their activities in which the colleges and universities are asked to participate are identical. In other words some of the major items in the program of the Office of Educational Exchange would appear to be a fulfillment on the part of our country of obligations assumed by our delegates in UNESCO Annual General Conferences. Therefore it appears to your Commission that a closer cooperation between the Office of Educational Exchange and the National Commission for UNESCO is highly desirable and we propose the following resolutions: be it

Resolved: that in the interest of greater and more effective participation in the program of international cooperation by the people of America the Board of Directors of this Association request the Secretary of State to seek a closer coordination between the budget and program for the domestic activities of the Office of Educational Exchange and the budget and program of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON MINORITY GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

GEORGE WM. McCLELLAND
CHAIRMAN, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN BEHALF of the Commission on Minority Groups in Higher Education, I am presenting a relatively brief progress report at this time. I would preface it, however, by the assurance that the members of the Commission, while encouraged by the increasing attention given during the past year in various sections of the country to the problem of undesirable discrimination in admissions, still believe firmly that a long-range educational program is involved, that this problem must be continually brought to the attention of this as well as other educational associations, and that the Commission should be continued.

Studies that have been made and published during the past few months in New York, in Connecticut and notably under the auspices of the American Council on Education have afforded factual evidence to support the charges that the American principle of equality of educational opportunity without regard to difference in sex, race, religion or nationality background has not prevailed as it should have, notably in some regions of the country in which special problems exist that are not too easy of solution.

On the other hand, there is reason for satisfaction in the modification of segregation practices relating to state-supported graduate and professional schools in seven states: Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas and West Virginia. It is hoped, too, that the expansion of facilities for higher education in the State of New York and elsewhere will alleviate somewhat the congestion that has worked unusual handicaps for many ambitious and able students during the period of swollen enrolments and that may have accentuated the use of selective procedures that have not been thought through philosophically.

A year ago the Commission reported that as an immediate step it would focus attention upon problems of admission; that it

would investigate cases of alleged discrimination and that it would bring to the Association from time to time well-considered and constructive recommendations looking towards the eventual disappearance of the minorities problem in American higher education.

No cases of supposed discrimination have been brought to the attention of the Commission either directly or through the office of the Executive Director, since its establishment two years ago. One cannot be certain of future developments, but it seems rather doubtful that the Commission will be called upon to function in this way.

During the course of the year, two representatives of our Commission were present at the significant Conference on Discrimination in College Admissions in Chicago called by the American Council on Education with the cooperation of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, and participated in its deliberations. At that conference were assembled representatives of 36 national and regional organizations concerned with higher education and 62 other leaders particularly interested in the problems under discussion. It seemed wise to the members of the Commission to await the report of that conference before attempting to suggest further steps to the Association. Although the full report has not yet reached publication, the recommendations of the conference have very recently been made available in Bulletin No. 149 issued by the American Council on Education, copies of which have been distributed widely and may be obtained without charge from the Council.

At its meeting on January 19, the Commission decided to give its general endorsement to these many recommendations, far too numerous to summarize here, and to commend them to the individual colleges and universities for careful study. In general, we approve the statements of policy, of general principles and of admission procedures that the members of the Chicago Conference accepted unanimously. We are glad to learn that the Conference also gave recognition to the economic as well as the social problems that stand in the way of equal educational opportunity for many of our promising youth, for they too are not easy of wise solution. We agree, that if progress is to continue, the problems need careful examination not merely by each in-

stitution of higher learning, but upon a state-by-state and upon a regional basis. We hope particularly that the American Council on Education will find it possible to undertake the three-year study that the Conference recommended to it, with many specific suggestions for the program of such a study. The Council's scope geographically and educationally is wider than that of any individual association and its opportunities for constructive results may well be far-reaching. If it undertakes the study, the members of our Commission stand ready to cooperate in any way that may seem helpful.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

RAYMOND WALTERS

PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

FOR nearly a year, negotiations have been under way looking toward financial aid from the Association of American Colleges which will permit the American College Public Relations Association to establish a central office. We believe that by means of such a central office, the public relations group could be of direct benefit to the Association of American Colleges and increase the services of both associations to higher education in general. Your Commission on Public Relations recommends favorable action in this matter if and when finances permit.

The chief service of the Commission on Public Relations during the past year was activity in the program of the American Council on Education, of which this Association is a constituent member. It appears appropriate to report briefly upon work of the Council's Committee on the Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government since, of this committee of seven, five are presidents of member institutions of the Association of American Colleges: Presidents Adam, New Hampshire; Carmichael, Tufts; Davidson, Union; Hancher, Iowa; Walters (Chairman), Cincinnati. In addition, a regular attendant upon invitation at committee meetings is the Executive Director, Guy E. Snively of the Association of American Colleges.

As emergency measures of the war and postwar periods were concluded, three trends developed which have called for consideration and action by the Federal Relationships Committee: Changing problems in respect to the Veterans Administration and veteran students attending colleges and universities under the G.I. Bill; expanding programs of national defense having effects upon colleges and universities, and increasing activity by the Federal Government in the field of public welfare, including higher education.

Typical of specific matters dealt with by the Federal Relationships Committee in its work of public relations are the following items listed in a recent Committee report:

1. Loans for faculty and student housing
2. Emergency assistance to schools of medicine and related fields
3. Extension of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits
4. Establishment of a National Science Foundation
5. Changes in the G.I. Bill
6. Donation of surplus property to educational institutions
7. Proposed Federal program of scholarships and fellowships

The Chairman of this Commission recently published his thirtieth annual SCHOOL AND SOCIETY (December 17, 1949) survey of approved U.S. four-year colleges and universities. Returns received as of November 1, 1949 from 753 institutions showed a decrease of 3.7 per cent in the number of full-time students as compared with 1948 and an increase in grand-total enrolment, covering full-time and part-time students, of 1.1 per cent. It is of interest that independent colleges of arts and sciences held full-time students in greater measure than the large universities. The 452 independent colleges supplying comparable statistics reported 415,811 full-time students,—a decrease of 2.8 per cent; and 482,772 grand total,—a .13 per cent increase. Their enrolments include 29.2 per cent of full-time veteran students.

SUPPLEMENTARY

While it concerns international rather than public relations in the usual sense, I take the liberty, as Chairman of this Commission, of referring to an address on "The Ideals of Educational Reforms in Japan," by President Shigeru Nambara of the University of Tokyo, whom I came to know well while in Japan last year. President Nambara spoke in Washington on December 10, 1949, at a conference sponsored by the American Council on Education, with the cooperation of the State Department. He was invited to come to Cincinnati for this meeting. In a letter to me, President Nambara expresses regret that he had to return to Tokyo by January 6. He authorized me to distribute to those in attendance copies of his Washington address. This is given in abbreviated form.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

W. W. WHITEHOUSE

PRESIDENT, ALBION COLLEGE

SINCE the last report to the Association the extensive research into the field of the education of secondary school teachers in the liberal arts colleges has been completed. This task was done by Dr. Van Cleve Morris under the guidance of Dr. Karl W. Bigelow at Teachers College, Columbia University. Your Commission desires to thank the promoters of this study for an important document. Thanks are due to the administrative officers of member institutions who participated in the study by completing the questionnaire report submitted. Some 374 institutions of all sizes and in different geographic sections supplied the requested data which covered the following areas of inquiry: current practices in secondary education programs in liberal arts colleges; judgments as to recent and predictable trends in this area; evaluation of trends and practices in teacher education by liberal arts educators. From this information a prospectus for the future was predicated. Abstracts of the study will be published in forthcoming issues of the BULLETIN of the Association and thus be made available for wide reading.

Becoming aware again of the wide participation in the preparation of secondary teachers by liberal arts colleges—by all reports they still carry a major share of this national load—the Commission makes the following observations and recommendations:

The present awakening of the people of the United States to the dangers that threaten our democratic form of government has brought a new conception of the importance of education in a democratic society. While the educative process is student centered, it is also generally recognized that the personality of the teacher and his preparation have taken on added significance, so much so in fact, that it can be argued that the recruitment of outstanding young men and women into the teaching profession and adequate training for this vocation are among the most important functions that our colleges and universities

can perform. It is on such trained teachers that democracy depends for its perpetuation. As Mr. Morris' report has expressed it, "The faithful yet critical transmission of a precious heritage is too delicate an operation to be delegated to ill-tutored minds. Those to whom a democratic people entrust this responsibility must themselves be among those most gifted and favored by natural endowment. But over and above that, these individuals, as trustees of the future of a free society, must be accorded the very best in education that this society can afford."

With this concept of the personality of the teacher and his preparation, the liberal arts college is in full accord. It recognizes, first of all, the importance of a cultivated mind as the primary endowment of every teacher, a mind broadened by contact with the humanities, freed from prejudice and conscious of our spiritual inheritance. It therefore believes that a background of general education and a thorough knowledge of subject-matter should be the first consideration in the preparation of teachers. Along with that should go a sensitivity to the needs and growth potentials of the person, together with a sound introduction to effective methods of teaching.

The liberal arts college, wherever its organizational pattern permits, is under an obligation to make a special contribution to spiritual values in the field of teacher education. There is a universal recognition of this outstanding need of the establishment of a religious consciousness as part of our culture.

We recognize the necessity to improve teaching in those colleges which are training teachers at the elementary and secondary level, both on the professional and on the content side. Thus, we dedicate ourselves to do a better job of providing both the liberal and cultural portions of the educational background for the teacher in training, and to do a better job of presenting and guiding him through the professional courses which are also essential to the adequate preparation of teachers. It is our hope that accrediting agencies and certifying agencies will so operate as to provide a flexible base for the training of secondary teachers so that the general philosophy and point of view of the liberal arts college can be maintained in such preparation. It seems to us most desirable that the general philosophy underlying the liberal arts college in its application to the

training of teachers should be encouraged, and the barriers which might be raised through unusually high specific requirements in certification should be considered very carefully with a view to maintaining the possibility of a continued supply of teachers from the liberal arts college.

Of interest to the liberal arts colleges is the fact that in the current development of educational programs more importance is being accorded to elementary education. This has been accelerated by the widespread adoption of the single-salary scale for teachers of all grades, as well as a recognition of the need of special training for the proper education of children of all ages. It has been further accelerated by the increasing demand for such teachers.

Here again, if a liberal arts college is desirous of providing for such a training program, it should be possible for it to do so. This means two things:

a. The point of view of the liberal arts college should be maintained in connection with such preparation. This, of course, means that the specific requirements for certification should be maintained at such a level as to permit the liberally educated individual to qualify for certification without having to give up his broad cultural background during the course of his college preparation.

b. This also means that any liberal arts college designed to train elementary teachers should be willing to "pay the price" for such training. The training of elementary teachers requires definite budget considerations, an adequate professional staff to take care of the professional education and the practice work, an adequate laboratory situation, either on the campus or in the public schools, and the dedication of the proper budgetary support for such developments. It is not an inexpensive program, and it will not pay for itself. Any institution which commits itself to such a program should do so with the full realization that it must dedicate a rather significant budgetary item to this purpose.

There is a growing necessity then for the liberal arts college, particularly in these days, to concentrate its purposes. No college can possibly do a high qualitative job if it spreads itself too thin. It would be entirely proper, in fact desirable, for a liberal arts college to decide that it is not its function to prepare either

elementary or secondary teachers in its efforts to concentrate on a smaller set of goals, and, thus, do a better job with each. It can be stated another way: Each college should be sure, before it takes on a new responsibility and new functions, to make certain that in broadening its scope to this extent it is not dooming itself or its products to mediocrity.

Your Commission recommends that a study be made concerning the field of elementary teacher education. There is a possibility of securing trained direction for such a study, as was the case in the project on the secondary level. We also would recommend the continuance of our affiliation with the National Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education. It is our intention to continue the fine relationships we have with other groups interested in the preparation of teachers.

REPORT OF MEETING OF PRESIDENTS' WIVES

RUTH KELLEY MONTGOMERY

WIFE OF PRESIDENT, MUSKINGUM COLLEGE

THE second meeting of the Presidents' Wives of the Association of American Colleges was called to order at 9:30 A.M., Tuesday, January 10, 1950.

As each person arrived she was given a card on which she wrote her name, college or university represented, and town where located. Wearing these tags helped in getting everyone acquainted.

The chairman gave a short introductory talk and reminded the wives of some of the necessary qualifications of a college president's wife. She should have a good sense of humor, strong arches and the graceful ability to "shift gears" quickly and easily, in order to fit into most any sort of a situation. She should be the essence of hospitality at all times and meanwhile try to preserve some sort of peaceful home atmosphere in which a tired, harassed but beloved college president husband can relax now and then. In other words, she must be able to make everyone feel welcome at the president's home, (even students on scavenger hunts who may want to pluck a hair from the president's head) and at the same time preserve a certain amount of privacy for home life and keep the entire family from having nervous breakdowns.

The chairman announced the topics suggested at the initial meeting in 1949, to be discussed at this 1950 meeting. They were as follows:

1. What do you do for your faculty?
2. What do you do for your students?
3. What do you do for your trustees?
4. What help in entertaining do you receive from the trustees?
5. To what extent should the home be the official hotel of the college?

Virtually every woman present took an active part in the discussion that followed. Many reported not only concerning their own personal entertaining of faculty, but also various types of

faculty clubs, faculty study and hobby-groups for wives, faculty family parties held on special occasions and occasional formal parties for husbands and wives. A "Newcomers Club" works well in several places where the wives meet once a month for various types of programs of music, literature, crafts, etc.; and the husbands are invited three or four times a year for special meetings. At the end of three years the members are automatically "promoted." There were suggestions for integrating the new and old faculty members, speaking of "old" and "new" in terms of length of service. Several wives advocated a lot of very informal entertaining in small faculty groups, always melding the new and older faculty together. The types of entertainment in the president's home ranged from a casual cup of tea by the fireside for half a dozen wives or family group suppers including the children, to large formal dinners with entertainment afterward.

On the subject of students, the wives were again bubbling over with ideas and enthusiasm. It was agreed that it is important to concentrate on the freshmen early in the year. It is perhaps better not to divulge publicly which wives bake their own cakes and hot rolls, nor to mention those who fry their own doughnuts for student breakfasts, as it might noticeably affect the enrolment next year. Some students who have hitherto been satisfied with store-cookies and bakery-rolls might decide to transfer to "greener pastures"!

The reports varied on expense of entertaining. All agreed it is definitely an expense, even though rich in rewards of friendship and fellowship with young and old. A large number of those present reported that the college pays the expense; others stated no allowance is made. There were several neophytes present who admitted they were innocently and happily sending all bills to the college treasurer! Several wives of longer and more expensive experience advised them to continue, unless they are suddenly told to do otherwise.

Some present felt that the president's home should not have to be an official hotel for the college because it is too much of a strain in many ways. Others said they have always done a great deal of that sort of entertaining and like to do it.

The time for discussion went by all too fast. So it was de-

cided to leave the question concerning entertaining trustees until next year, when it could have more time devoted to it. All present felt it is an important question and should not be slighted.

The topics suggested for 1951 were:

1. What do you do for your trustees and their wives?
2. What do you do about wedding gifts, baby gifts, etc. for students and alumni?
3. Discuss ideas for fostering a healthy, happy relationship between college and community.
4. How much should be expected of the dean and his wife in entertaining faculty and students?
5. Glimpses of presidents' homes in regard to size, amount of domestic help employed, etc.

It might be a happy follow-up at the next meeting to enjoy the fellowship of a group luncheon at the close of the wives' discussion. It would certainly help in knowing each other better which is one of the purposes of this meeting.

All who attended agreed that they were stimulated and helped by the discussion of some of these mutual problems and responsibilities. Every woman present felt it a privilege to be able to be counted a member of that great and choice circle known as the "Presidents' Wives of the Association of American Colleges."

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS

Minutes of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Association
of American Colleges

JANUARY 9-11, 1950

HOTEL NETHERLAND PLAZA
CINCINNATI, OHIO

First Session

THE thirty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges was called to order at 8:00 P.M., January 9, 1950, by the President, Vincent J. Flynn, president of the College of St. Thomas. Prayer was offered by President Henry W. A. Hanson of Gettysburg College.

President Flynn announced the appointment of the following committees:

Committee on Nominations

President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University, *Chairman*
Sister Mary Frances, Xavier University
President Fred G. Holloway, Drew University
President Morgan S. Odell, Lewis and Clark College
President Kenneth C. M. Sills, Bowdoin College

Committee on Resolutions

President Nathan M. Pusey, Lawrence College, *Chairman*
President Leonard Carmichael, Tufts College
Vice President Theodore M. Hesburgh, University of Notre
Dame
President Weir C. Ketler, Grove City College
Sister Catherine Dorothea, Trinity College

President Flynn introduced President Hachiro Yuasa, President of the Japan International Christian University and Doctor and Mrs. Robert L. Kelly of Claremont, California. Dr. Kelly was one of the founders and first president of the Association; he was executive secretary of the Association from 1917-

NOTE: The addresses and commission reports are to be found in this issue of the BULLETIN.

1937. An ovation was given the Kellys in recognition of their great service to the Association.

The theme of the program of the annual meeting was "Great Teaching—The Essence of Liberal Education." Nearly 700 delegates registered.

Bishop William T. Mulloy of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Covington, Kentucky, delivered an address on "Great Teaching and the Religious Spirit." Dr. D. Elton Trueblood of the faculty of Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, gave an address on "The Idea of a College."

Second Session

President Flynn called the Tuesday morning session to order at 9:30 A.M., January 10, 1950. The first order of business was the annual report by Treasurer LeRoy E. Kimball. He submitted the auditor's statement of the financial operations for the past year. He presented with detailed explanations the proposed budget for 1950. On motion, the report was approved and the budget adopted.

The Executive Director read his annual report which included pertinent observations and details of the year's work. He read the report of the Board of Directors. On motion, both reports were received and the recommendations included in the Board's report were approved. Both reports are published on preceding pages.

President Flynn presented some fifty of the new member presidents who were in attendance.

Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne, President of Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, spoke on "Good Teaching and Public Relations."

President John W. Davis of West Virginia State College gave an address on "The Unfinished Business of Great Teaching."

President Francis P. Gaines of Washington and Lee University spoke on "The Overplus of Good Teaching."

President Cloyd H. Marvin of George Washington University outlined the activities of "The National Commission on Accrediting."

Chancellor Rufus H. Fitzgerald of the University of Pitts-

burgh presented his report as Chairman of the Commission on the Arts.

Chairman Mark H. Ingraham, Dean of the University of Wisconsin, gave a report for the Committee on Insurance and Annuities which had been drawn up in cooperation with the officers of the American Association of University Professors. He announced that this report, to be published in the May issue of the BULLETIN, was of a tentative nature and requested that it be studied by the membership for consideration and action at the next annual meeting.

Chairman William W. Whitehouse, President of Albion College, gave the report of the Commission on Teacher Education.

Director Ben M. Cherrington of the University of Denver gave his report as Chairman of the Commission on International Cultural Relations. After discussion and elaboration of the report by President Hutchins of Berea College, President Lucas of Sweet Briar College and President Singleton of Mary Hardin-Baylor College, the recommendations contained in the report were approved.

Following brief announcements, the morning session adjourned for luncheon about 12:15 P.M.

Third Session

The delegates were called to order at 2:30 P.M. by President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University, Vice President of the Association, who served as presiding officer of this session, which was devoted primarily to the interests of the Commission on Christian Higher Education. Reports on the activities of the year were made by Chairman McLain and Executive Secretary Robert N. DuBose. Stimulating addresses on "Lessons for American Higher Education" were made by President Conrad Bergendoff of Augustana College and Dr. Ruth Seabury, Secretary of Education of the Congregational Board of Missions. The former spoke of observations made on a recent visit to Europe and the latter from observations made during periods of residence and visitation in Asia.

Then followed a panel discussion participated in by President Raymond F. McLain, Transylvania College, *Chairman*; Rev-

erend Edward B. Rooney, Executive Director, Jesuit Educational Association; President Ralph W. Lloyd of Maryville College; President Floyd H. Black, Robert College, Istanbul.

Pertinent comments were made by President Jones of Earlham College and President Singleton of Mary Hardin-Baylor College.

Chairman George William McClelland, University of Pennsylvania, presented the report of the Commission on Minority Groups in Higher Education.

Chairman Brown of the Nominating Committee presented the proposed list of officers and commission members for the year 1950. This committee followed the instructions, voted at two earlier annual meetings, that the commissions be arranged to indicate the three-year term of office of the members of the respective commissions. On motion, the officers and commission members, whose names are printed in the front pages of the *BULLETIN*, were elected.

After announcements, the meeting was adjourned at about 5:30 P.M.

Fourth Session

The Annual Dinner was held at 7:00 P.M. with President Flynn in the chair. Robert Rounseville, tenor, and Lionel Nowak, pianist, on the Association Arts Program, rendered an impressive program of music which was accorded an enthusiastic reception.

Next followed the presidential address by the Very Reverend Vincent J. Flynn and an address by Administrator Paul G. Hoffman of the United States Economic Cooperation Administration. Enthusiastic applause was given both addresses.

Fifth Session

President Flynn opened the Wednesday morning session at 9:30 A.M. President Harold E. Stassen of the University of Pennsylvania gave a preliminary report for the Commission on Colleges and Industry of which he is chairman.

Executive Director John D. Millett gave a report for the new Commission on Financing Higher Education, operating under the sponsorship of the Association of American Universities.

After these two informative speeches there ensued considerable discussion in which the following members participated: President Turner of Hillsdale College, President Davidson of Union College, President Zwingle of Park College, President Masters of Albright College, Dean Morrow of the University of Pennsylvania, President McClelland of MacMurray College, President French of Hastings College, President Harrison of Adrian College, President Moron of Hampton Institute, President Coons of Occidental College and President Flynn of the College of St. Thomas.

President Raymond Walters of the University of Cincinnati reported as Chairman of the Commission on Public Relations.

Chairman Carter Davidson, President of Union College, gave the following report for the Committee on Student Health and Accident Insurance which was approved by the Association:

A year ago there was considerable interest shown among the member colleges in a plan of cooperative group insurance for the medical expenses of students incurred through accidents and through sickness. Your committee was appointed to investigate and to report back at this meeting. We have met with several insurance agents and are prepared to recommend that the Association of American Colleges endorse such a plan of group insurance for its members, for the following reasons:

- (1) Responsibility for medical care of students during the college year is now generally accepted by our member colleges;

- (2) Most individual students and individual colleges cannot afford the high rates of medical, surgical and hospital care, nor can they secure reasonable rates for such insurance as individuals;

- (3) By banding together the colleges of the Association can get a reasonable basic rate and through group organization can secure experience adjustments to the benefit of both colleges and students.

Your committee having investigated several possibilities, recommends the appointment of the Continental Casualty Company of Chicago, Illinois, as the insuring company, and of Terbush and Powell of New York, as our agents. We suggest that they be authorized to send to the members, in the name of the Association, complete information about basic rates, with the various combinations of coverage which will

allow for individualization of the programs of the colleges, according to their needs and desires.

Respectfully submitted,
Carter Davidson, *Chairman*
LeRoy E. Kimball
W. H. Cramblet

Chairman Pusey, President of Lawrence College, presented the following report of the Committee on Resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS

I

Resolved: That this Association express its gratitude to the University of Cincinnati and to its president for their readiness to assist the Association with this meeting—especially for the very helpful services of the University's division of public relations.

II

Resolved: That the members of this Association express their sincere gratitude to the genial Dr. Guy E. Snavelly, who has given the Association able, friendly and devoted leadership through another, his thirteenth year, as our Executive Director.

III

Resolved: That the members of this Association express their gratitude and high approval to the Very Reverend Vincent J. Flynn for his conscientious and skillful leadership as president during the past year, by virtue of which in no small measure the Association was enabled again, in its thirty-sixth year, to carry on its work successfully and with dispatch.

IV

Resolved: That the great pleasure experienced by members of this Association through the presence at the present meeting of Dr. and Mrs. Robert L. Kelly be made a matter of record, and that our good wishes, high regard and lasting gratitude be expressed to them.

V

Resolved: That the Association of American Colleges express its approval of various attempts which are being made by many colleges through reciprocal scholarship grants to ease the path by which college faculty children are enabled to gain enriched educational opportunity, and that it en-

courage extension of this procedure wherever colleges can work out acceptable means for joining in what is clearly a commendable program.

VI

Resolved: That this Association express its confidence in and gratitude to the many agencies such as the World Student Service Fund, CARE, UNESCO's Book Program and others which have done so much during the war and since, not only to provide urgent material relief for stricken personnel but also to foster understanding and cooperation among teachers and students of all peoples throughout the world.

VII

In a time when the financing of higher education has become perilously difficult and when it is clear that it is shortly to become more so,

Be It Resolved: That the Association of American Colleges express its profound gratitude to all those individuals, church bodies, corporations, foundations and other agencies in various parts of the country who have given generously to the maintenance and extension of the work of the member colleges during the past year.

Believing in the importance of our colleges and universities to the cultural, religious, economic and political welfare of the nation and realizing their urgent need for continued and increased resources, this Association also bespeaks an awakened sense of responsibility in, and the generous help of, all friends of higher education for our colleges in the coming year.

VIII

Since we believe that the needs of colleges and universities for organizations representing them on the national level are already adequately provided for by such proved agencies especially as this Association, the Association of American Universities, the American Council on Education, and in this instance, also, the American Association of University Professors, these among others, each serving higher education in its special way, therefore

Be It Resolved: First, that this organization call upon its members for a fresh awareness of its own essential task and program, and second, that it record its regret that the National Education Association now apparently feels called upon to share in, or even to assume obligation for, the needs of higher education for national organization already adequately cared for by these other organizations.

This report was read item by item and adopted after discussion of several of the concluding items by President Jones of Earlham College, President Bond of Salem College, President Carmichael of Tufts College, President Wildman of DePauw University, Dean Roberts of Lindenwood College and Dean Ingraham of the University of Wisconsin.

The Meeting adjourned at about 11:45 A.M.

Sixth Session

The final session of the Annual Meeting was held at luncheon at 12:30 P.M. Chairman Flynn gave a brief eulogy on the seventeen years of faithful and efficient service given as Treasurer of the Association by Vice Chancellor LeRoy E. Kimball of New York University who was elected on Tuesday afternoon as Vice President of the Association.

The program of the 1950 Annual Meeting was concluded with an eloquent address on "Interdependence of Education and Industry" by Wallace F. Bennett, Chairman of National Association of Manufacturers.

* * *

On January 9 the commissions and committees of the Association held meetings. On that day was held also a well-attended meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans. There were sessions also of the Executive Committee of the Division of Higher Education of the National Catholic Educational Association and of the University Senate of the Methodist Board of Education.

On the afternoon of January 9 and throughout January 11 and 12 were held a number of meetings of denominational educational groups and of the National Protestant Council on Higher Education.

On the forenoon of Tuesday, January 10, was held a meeting of the wives of the delegates presided over by Mrs. Robert N. Montgomery, wife of the President of Muskingum College. A report of this meeting is to be found elsewhere in this issue of the BULLETIN.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE YEAR ENDING JANUARY, 1951

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director

726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.
19 W. 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1950-51

President: Daniel L. Marsh, President, Boston University.

Vice President: LeRoy E. Kimball, Vice Chancellor, New York University.

Treasurer: John R. Cunningham, President, Davidson College.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavely.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

Board of Directors: (additional members) M. E. Sadler, President, Texas Christian University; G. Herbert Smith, President, Willamette University; Clark G. Kuebler, President, Ripon College; Celestin J. Steiner, President, University of Detroit.

By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

INSTITUTION

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

ALABAMA

Alabama College, Montevallo	John T. Caldwell
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn	Ralph B. Draughon
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham	George R. Stuart
Howard College, Birmingham	Harwell G. Davis
Huntingdon College, Montgomery	Hubert Searcy
Judson College, Marion	J. I. Riddle
Miles College, Birmingham	W. A. Bell
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill	William P. Donnelly
Talladega College, Talladega	A. D. Beittel
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee	Frederick D. Patterson
University of Alabama, University	John M. Gallalee

ALASKA

University of Alaska, College	Terris Moore
-------------------------------------	--------------

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson J. Byron McCormick

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff

Lawrence A. Davis

Arkansas State College, Jonesboro W. J. Edens

College of the Ozarks, Clarksville Fred A. Walker

Hendrix College, Conway Matt L. Ellis

Ouachita College, Arkadelphia S. W. Eubanks

Philander Smith College, Little Rock M. LaFayette Harris

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Lewis Webster Jones

CALIFORNIA

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena Lee A. DuBridge

Claremont Men's College, Claremont George C. S. Benson

College of the Holy Names, Oakland Sister M. Rose Emmanuel

College of the Pacific, Stockton Robert E. Burns

Dominican College, San Rafael Sister Mary Thomas

George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles Hugh M. Tiner

Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles Sister Mary Eucharia

La Sierra College, Arlington G. T. Anderson

La Verne College, La Verne Harold D. Fasnacht

Loyola University, Los Angeles Charles S. Casassa

Mills College, Oakland Lynn T. White, Jr.

Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles Mother Agnes Marie O'Laughlin

Occidental College, Los Angeles Arthur G. Coons

Pacific Union College, Angwin Percy W. Christian

Pasadena College, Pasadena Westlake T. Purkiser

Pomona College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont E. Wilson Lyon

St. Mary's College, St. Mary's College P. O. Brother Austin

San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco Mother Leonor Mejia

Scripps College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont Frederick Hard

Stanford University, Stanford University J. E. Wallace Sterling

University of Redlands, Redlands George H. Armacost

University of San Francisco, San Francisco William J. Dunne

University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara William C. Gianera

University of Southern California, Los Angeles Fred D. Fagg, Jr.

Whittier College, Whittier Wm. C. Jones

COLORADO

Colorado College, Colorado Springs William H. Gill

Loretto Heights College, Loretto Sister Frances Marie

University of Colorado, Boulder Robert L. Stearns

University of Denver, Denver Albert C. Jacobs

CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven Sister M. Coralita

Connecticut College, New London	Rosemary Park
Saint Joseph College, West Hartford	Sister M. Rosa, <i>Dean</i>
Trinity College, Hartford	George Keith Funston
Wesleyan University, Middletown	Victor L. Butterfield
Yale University, New Haven	Charles Seymour

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark	Allan P. Colburn, <i>Acting</i>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University, Washington	Paul F. Douglass
Catholic University of America, Washington	P. J. McCormick
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Washington	Sister Mary Frederick
George Washington University, Washington	C. H. Marvin
Georgetown University, Washington	Hunter Guthrie
Howard University, Washington	Mordecai W. Johnson
Trinity College, Washington	Sister Catherine Dorothea
Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park	William H. Shephard

FLORIDA

Barry College, Miami	Sister M. Dorothy, <i>Dean</i>
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee	H. Manning Efferson, <i>Acting</i>
Florida Southern College, Lakeland	Ludd M. Spivey
Florida State University, Tallahassee	Doak S. Campbell
John B. Stetson University, Deland	J. Ollie Edmunds
Rollins College, Winter Park	Paul A. Wagner
University of Florida, Gainesville	J. Hillis Miller
University of Miami, Coral Gables	Bowman F. Ashe

GEORGIA

Agnes Scott College, Decatur	James R. McCain
Atlanta University, Atlanta	Rufus E. Clement
Berry College, Mount Berry	James A. Lindsay
Bessie Tift College, Forsyth	W. Fred Gunn
Brenau College, Gainesville	Josiah Crudup
Clark College, Atlanta	James P. Brawley
Emory University, Emory University	Goodrich C. White
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta	Blake R. Van Leer
Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville	Guy H. Wells
LaGrange College, LaGrange	Waights G. Henry, Jr.
Mercer University, Macon	Spright Dowell
Morehouse College, Atlanta	Benjamin E. Mays
Morris Brown College, Atlanta	Wm. A. Fountain, Jr.
Paine College, Augusta	E. C. Peters
Piedmont College, Demorest	James E. Walter
Shorter College, Rome	Charles W. Burts
Spelman College, Atlanta	Florence M. Read

University of Georgia, Athens	J. C. Rogers
Valdosta State College, Valdosta	J. Ralph Thaxton
Wesleyan College, Macon	Silas Johnson

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu	Gregg M. Sinclair
--------------------------------------	-------------------

IDAHO

College of Idaho, Caldwell	L. A. Williams, <i>Acting</i>
Idaho State College, Pocatello	Carl W. McIntosh, Jr.
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa	L. T. Corlett

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island	Conrad Bergendoff
Aurora College, Aurora	Theodore Pierson Stephens
Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest	Mother Margaret Reilly
Bradley University, Peoria	David B. Owen
Carthage College, Carthage	Morris Wee
College of St. Frances, Joliet	Sister M. Aniceta
De Paul University, Chicago	Comerford O'Malley
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst	Henry W. Dinkmeyer
Eureka College, Eureka	Burrus Dickinson
George Williams College, Chicago	Harold C. Coffman
Greenville College, Greenville	Henry J. Long
Illinois College, Jacksonville	H. Gary Hudson
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington	Merrill J. Holmes
James Millikin University, Decatur	J. Walter Malone
Knox College, Galesburg	Sharvy G. Umbeck
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest	Ernest A. Johnson
Loyola University, Chicago	James T. Hussey
MacMurray College, Jacksonville	Clarence P. McClelland
McKendree College, Lebanon	Ralph Grow
Monmouth College, Monmouth	J. H. Grier
Mundelein College, Chicago	Sister Mary Josephine
North Central College, Naperville	C. Harve Geiger
Northwestern University, Evanston	James Roscoe Miller
Quincy College, Quincy	Henry Freiburg
Rockford College, Rockford	Mary Ashby Cheek
Roosevelt College of Chicago	Edward J. Sparling
Rosary College, River Forest	Sister Mary Timothea
St. Francis Xavier College for Women, Chicago	Sister Mary Huberta
Shurtleff College, Alton	David A. Weaver
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	D. W. Morris
The Principia, Elsah	F. E. Morgan
University of Chicago, Chicago	Robert M. Hutchins
University of Illinois, Urbana	Henning Larsen, <i>Dean</i>
Wheaton College, Wheaton	V. R. Edman

INDIANA

Anderson College, Anderson	John A. Morrison
Butler University, Indianapolis	Maurice O. Ross
DePauw University, Greencastle	Clyde E. Wildman
Earlham College, Richmond	Thomas E. Jones
Evansville College, Evansville	Lincoln B. Hale
Franklin College, Franklin	Harold W. Richardson
Goshen College, Goshen	Ernest E. Miller
Hanover College, Hanover	Albert G. Parker, Jr.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis	I. Lynd Esch
Indiana University, Bloomington	Herman B. Wells
Manchester College, North Manchester	V. F. Schwalm
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute	Ford L. Wilkinson, Jr.
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods	Mother Marie Helene
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame	Sister M. Madeleva
Taylor University, Upland	Clyde W. Meredith
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame	John J. Cavanaugh
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso	O. P. Kretzmann
Wabash College, Crawfordsville	Frank Hugh Sparks

IOWA

Briar Cliff College, Sioux City	Sister Jean Marie
Central College, Pella	G. T. Vander Lugt
Clarke College, Dubuque	Sister Mary Anne Leone
Coe College, Cedar Rapids	Byron S. Hollinshead
Cornell College, Mt. Vernon	Russell D. Cole
Drake University, Des Moines	Henry Gadd Harmon
Grinnell College, Grinnell	Samuel Nowell Stevens
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant	J. Raymond Chadwick
Loras College, Dubuque	S. D. Luby
Luther College, Decorah	J. Wilhelm Ylvisaker
Morningside College, Sioux City	Earl A. Roadman
Parsons College, Fairfield	Tom E. Shearer
St. Ambrose College, Davenport	Ambrose J. Burke
Simpson College, Indianola	Edwin E. Voigt
State University of Iowa, Iowa City	Virgil M. Hancher
University of Dubuque, Dubuque	Rollo C. La Porte
Upper Iowa University, Fayette	Vivian T. Smith
Wartburg College, Wartburg	C. H. Becker
William Penn College, Oskaloosa	Charles S. Bell

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin	Nelson P. Horn
Bethany College, Lindsborg	Emory Lindquist
Bethel College, North Newton	Edmund G. Kaufman
College of Emporia, Emporia	Paul B. McCleave

Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays	M. C. Cunningham
Friends University, Wichita	S. Arthur Watson
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina	Herbert J. Root
Marymount College, Salina	Mother Mary Chrysostom Wynn
McPherson College, McPherson	W. W. Peters
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison	Mother Lucy Dooley
Ottawa University, Ottawa	Andrew B. Martin
St. Mary College, Xavier	A. M. Murphy
Southwestern College, Winfield	Alvin W. Murray
Sterling College, Sterling	William M. McCreery
University of Wichita, Wichita	Harry F. Corbin
Washburn Municipal University, Topeka	Bryan S. Stoffer

KENTUCKY

Asbury College, Wilmore	Z. T. Johnson
Berea College, Berea	Francis Stephenson Hutchins
Centre College, Danville	Walter A. Groves
Georgetown College, Georgetown	Samuel S. Hill
Kentucky Wesleyan College, Winchester	Paul Shell Powell
Nazareth College, Louisville	Sister Mary Anastasia Coady
Transylvania College, Lexington	Raymond F. McLain
Union College, Barbourville	Conway Boatman
University of Kentucky, Lexington	Herman Lee Donovan
University of Louisville, Louisville	John W. Taylor

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport	Joe J. Mickle
Dillard University, New Orleans	Albert W. Dent
Louisiana College, Pineville	Edgar Godbold
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston	Claybrook Cottingham
Louisiana State University, University	Harold W. Stoke
Loyola University, New Orleans	Thomas J. Shields
Newcomb College, New Orleans	Logan Wilson, <i>Dean</i>
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches	G. W. McGinty, <i>Acting</i>
St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans	Sister Mary Louise
Southern University, Scotlandville	F. G. Clark
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette	Joel L. Fletcher
Tulane University, New Orleans	Rufus C. Harris
Ursuline College, New Orleans	Mother M. Celeste Hanlon
Xavier University, New Orleans	Mother M. Agatha

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston	Chas. F. Phillips
Bowdoin College, Brunswick	Kenneth C. M. Sills
Colby College, Waterville	Julius Seelye Bixler
College of Our Lady of Mercy, Portland	Daniel J. O'Neill
University of Maine, Orono	Arthur A. Hauck

MARYLAND

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore	Sister Mary Frances
Goucher College, Baltimore	Otto F. Kraushaar
Hood College, Frederick	Andrew G. Truxal
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore	Detlev W. Bronk
Loyola College, Baltimore	Francis X. Talbot
Morgan State College, Baltimore	Martin D. Jenkins
Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore	Sister Mary Placide
Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg	J. L. Sheridan
St. John's College, Annapolis	Richard D. Weigle
St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg	Francis J. Dodd
United States Naval Academy, Annapolis	J. L. Holloway, Jr.
University of Maryland, College Park	H. C. Byrd
Washington College, Chestertown	F. G. Livingood, <i>Acting</i>
Western Maryland College, Westminster	Lowell S. Ensor
Woodstock College, Woodstock	Joseph C. Glose, <i>Director</i>

MASSACHUSETTS

American International College, Springfield	William Gellerman
Amherst College, Amherst	Charles W. Cole
Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster	L. N. Holm
Boston College, Chestnut Hill	William L. Keleher
Boston University, Boston	Daniel L. Marsh
Clark University, Worcester	Howard B. Jefferson
College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee	John H. Rooney, <i>Vice-President</i>
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester	John A. O'Brien
Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy	Edward S. Mann
Emmanuel College, Boston	Sister Margaret Patricia
Harvard University, Cambridge	James B. Conant
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge	James R. Killian, Jr.
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley	Roswell G. Ham
Northeastern University, Boston	Carl S. Ell
Regis College, Weston	Sister Mary Saint Ignatius
Simmons College, Boston	Bancroft Beatley
Smith College, Northampton	Benjamin F. Wright
Springfield College, Springfield	Paul M. Limbert
Tufts College, Tufts College	Leonard Carmichael
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Ralph A. Van Meter
Wellesley College, Wellesley	Margaret Clapp
Wheaton College, Norton	A. Howard Meneely
Williams College, Williamstown	James P. Baxter, III
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester	Wat Tyler Cluverius

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian	Samuel J. Harrison
Albion College, Albion	William W. Whitehouse
Alma College, Alma	Dale D. Welch

Calvin College, Grand Rapids	Henry Schultze
Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs	Alvin W. Johnson
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale	Harvey Leonard Turner
Hope College, Holland	Irwin J. Lubbers
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo	John Scott Everton
Marygrove College, Detroit	Sister M. Honora
Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing	John A. Hannah
Nazareth College, Nazareth	Sister M. Kevin
Olivet College, Olivet	Aubrey L. Ashby
Siena Heights College, Adrian	Mother M. Gerald
University of Detroit, Detroit	Celestin J. Steiner
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor	A. G. Ruthven
Wayne University, Detroit	David D. Henry

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis	Bernhard Christensen
Carleton College, Northfield	Laurence M. Gould
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph	Mother Richarda Peters
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul	Sister Antonine O'Brien
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth	Mother M. Anthanasius Braegelman
College of St. Teresa, Winona	Sister M. Rachel Dady
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul	Vincent J. Flynn
Concordia College, Moorhead	J. N. Brown
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter	Edgar M. Carlson
Hamline University, St. Paul	Hurst R. Anderson
Macalester College, St. Paul	Charles J. Turck
St. Mary's College, Winona	Brother Joel
St. Olaf College, Northfield	Clemens M. Granskou
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis	T. Raymond McConnell, <i>Dean</i>

MISSISSIPPI

Belhaven College, Jackson	G. T. Gillespie
Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain	Lawrence T. Lowrey
Millsaps College, Jackson	Marion L. Smith
Mississippi College, Clinton	D. M. Nelson
Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg	R. C. Cook
Mississippi State College, State College	Fred T. Mitchell
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus	B. L. Parkinson
University of Mississippi, University	John Davis Williams

MISSOURI

Central College, Fayette	Ralph L. Woodward
College of St. Teresa, Kansas City	Sister Marietta Jennings
Culver-Stockton College, Canton	W. H. McDonald
Drury College, Springfield	James Franklin Findlay
Fontbonne College, St. Louis	Mother M. Bernice O'Neill

Lindenwood College, St. Charles	Franc L. McCluer
Maryville College, St. Louis	Mother Marie-Odéide Mouton
Missouri Valley College, Marshall	J. F. Doering, <i>Acting</i>
Park College, Parkville	J. L. Zwingle
Rockhurst College, Kansas City	Thomas J. Knapp
St. Louis University, St. Louis	Paul C. Reinert
Tarkio College, Tarkio	M. Earle Collins
University of Kansas City, Kansas City	Clarence R. Decker
University of Missouri, Columbia	F. A. Middlebush
Washington University, St. Louis	Arthur H. Compton
Webster College, Webster Groves	Sister Mariella, <i>Acting</i>
Westminster College, Fulton	William W. Hall, Jr.
William Jewell College, Liberty	Walter Pope Binns

MONTANA

Carroll College, Helena	Emmet J. Riley
College of Great Falls, Great Falls	J. J. Donovan
Montana State University, Missoula	James A. McCain
Rocky Mountain College, Billings	William D. Copeland

NEBRASKA

Creighton University, Omaha	William H. McCabe
Doane College, Crete	David L. Crawford
Duchesne College, Omaha	Mother Mary Downey
Hastings College, Hastings	Wm. Marshall French
Midland College, Fremont	W. F. Hieronymus
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln	Carl C. Bracy
Union College, Lincoln	Robert W. Woods
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	R. G. Gustavson
University of Omaha, Omaha	Milo Bail
York College, York	Walter E. Bachman

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover	John S. Dickey
Mount St. Mary College, Hookset	Sister M. De La Salle
Rivier College, Nashua	Sister Marie Carmella, <i>Dean</i>
St. Anselm's College, Manchester	Bertrand C. Dolan
University of New Hampshire, Durham	Arthur S. Adams

NEW JERSEY

College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station	Sister Marie José Byrne
Drew University, Madison	Fred G. Holloway
Georgian Court College, Lakewood	Sister Marie Anna
New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, New Brunswick	Margaret T. Corwin, <i>Dean</i>
Newark College of Engineering, Newark	Robert W. Van Houten
Princeton University, Princeton	Harold W. Dodds

Rutgers University, New Brunswick	Robert C. Clothier
St. Peter's College, Jersey City	James J. Shanahan
Seton Hall College, South Orange	John L. McNulty
Upsala College, East Orange	Evald B. Lawson

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque	Thomas L. Popejoy
---	-------------------

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Garden City	Paul D. Eddy
Alfred University, Alfred	M. Ellis Drake
Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson	Edward C. Fuller
Barnard College, Columbia University, New York	Millicent Carey McIntosh, <i>Dean</i>
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn	Harry David Gideonse
Canisius College, Buffalo	Raymond W. Schouten
Clarkson College of Technology, Pottsdam	Jess H. Davis
Colgate University, Hamilton	Everett Needham Case
College of the City of New York, New York	Harry N. Wright
College of Mount St. Vincent, New York	Sister Catharine Marie, <i>Dean</i>
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle	Mother Dorothea, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Rose, Albany	Sister Rose of Lima, <i>Dean</i>
Columbia College, Columbia University, New York	Harry J. Carman, <i>Dean</i>
Cornell University, Ithaca	C. W. deKiewiet, <i>Acting</i>
D'Youville College, Buffalo	Sister Margaret
Elmira College, Elmira	Lewis Eldred
Fordham University, New York	Laurence J. McGinley
Good Counsel College, White Plains	Sister Mary Dolores
Hamilton College, Clinton	Robert W. McEwen
Hartwick College, Oneonta	Henry J. Arnold
Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva	Alan W. Brown
Hofstra College, Hempstead	J. C. Adams
Houghton College, Houghton	Stephen W. Paine
Hunter College, New York	George N. Shuster
Keuka College, Keuka Park	Katherine G. Blyley
Manhattan College, New York	Brother Bonaventure Thomas
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, New York	Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne
Marymount College, Tarrytown	Mother M. Gerard
Nazareth College, Rochester	Sister Teresa Marie, <i>Dean</i>
New York University, New York	LeRoy E. Kimball, <i>Vice Chancellor</i>
Niagara University, Niagara Falls	Francis L. Meade
Notre Dame College of Staten Island, Grymes Hill	Mother St. Egbert
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn	Harry S. Rogers
Queens College, Flushing	John J. Theobald
Russell Sage College, Troy	Lewis A. Froman
St. Bonaventure College, St. Bonaventure	Juvenal Lalor

St. Francis College, Brooklyn	Brother Columba
St. John's University, Brooklyn	John A. Flynn
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn	William T. Dillon
St. Lawrence University, Canton	Eugene G. Bewkes
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville	Harold Taylor
Siena College, Loudonville	Mark Kennedy
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs	Henry T. Moore
Syracuse University, Syracuse	William P. Tolley
Union College, Schenectady	Carter Davidson
United States Military Academy, West Point	Bryant E. Moore
University of Buffalo, Buffalo	Samuel P. Capen
University of Rochester, Rochester	Alan C. Valentine
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie	Sarah G. Blanding
Wagner College, Staten Island	Walter C. Langsam
Wells College, Aurora	Jerome H. Bentley, <i>Acting</i>
Yeshiva University, New York	Samuel Belkin

NORTH CAROLINA

Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro	F. D. Bluford
Bennett College, Greensboro	David D. Jones
Catawba College, Salisbury	Alvin Robert Keppel
Davidson College, Davidson	John R. Cunningham
Duke University, Durham	A. Hollis Edens
Elon College, Elon College	L. E. Smith
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs	Marshall S. Woodson
Greensboro College, Greensboro	Luther L. Gobbel
Guilford College, Guilford	Clyde A. Milner
High Point College, High Point	Dennis H. Cooke
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte	Hardy Liston
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory	Voight R. Cromer
Livingstone College, Salisbury	W. J. Trent
Meredith College, Raleigh	Carlyle Campbell
North Carolina College at Durham	Alfonso Elder
Queens College, Charlotte	Hunter B. Blakely
St. Augustine's College, Raleigh	Harold L. Trigg
Salem College, Winston-Salem	Dale H. Gramley
Shaw University, Raleigh	W. R. Strassner, <i>Acting</i>
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Gordon Gray
Wake Forest College, Wake Forest	Thurman D. Kitchin

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown	Samuel S. George
------------------------------------	------------------

OHIO

Antioch College, Yellow Springs	Douglas McGregor
Ashland College, Ashland	Glen L. Clayton
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea	John L. Knight

Bluffton College, Bluffton	Lloyd L. Ramseyer
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green	Frank J. Prout
Capital University, Columbus	Harold L. Yoehum
College of Education and Industrial Arts, Wilberforce	Charles H. Wesley
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph	Sister Maria Corona, <i>Dean</i>
College of St. Mary of the Springs, Columbus	Sister M. Angelita
College of Wooster, Wooster	Howard F. Lowry
Defiance College, Defiance	Harold Dana Hopkins
Denison University, Granville	Kenneth I. Brown
Fenn College, Cleveland	Edward Hodnett
Findlay College, Findlay	H. Clifford Fox
Heidelberg College, Tiffin	Wm. Terry Wickham
Hiram College, Hiram	Paul H. Fall
John Carroll University, Cleveland	Frederick E. Welfie
Kent State University, Kent	George A. Bowman
Kenyon College, Gambier	Gordon Keith Chalmers
Lake Erie College, Painesville	Helen D. Bragdon
Marietta College, Marietta	W. Bay Irvine
Mary Manse College, Toledo	Sister M. Catherine Raynor
Miami University, Oxford	Ernest H. Habne
Mount Union College, Alliance	Charles B. Ketcham
Muskingum College, New Concord	Robert N. Montgomery
Notre Dame College, South Euclid	Mother Mary Anselm
Oberlin College, Oberlin	William E. Stevenson
Ohio Northern University, Ada	F. B. McIntosh
Ohio State University, Columbus	H. L. Bevis
Ohio University, Athens	John C. Baker
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware	Arthur S. Flemming
Otterbein College, Westerville	J. Gordon Howard
University of Akron, Akron	H. E. Simmons
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati	Raymond Walters
University of Dayton, Dayton	George J. Renneker
University of Toledo, Toledo	Wilbur W. White
Ursuline College, Cleveland	Mother Marie
Western College, Oxford	Philip E. Henderson
Western Reserve University, Cleveland	John S. Millis
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce	Charles L. Hill
Wilmington College, Wilmington	Samuel D. Marble
Wittenberg College, Springfield	Clarence C. Stoughton
Xavier University, Cincinnati	James F. Maguire
Youngstown College, Youngstown	Howard W. Jones

OKLAHOMA

Bethany-Peniel College, Bethany	Roy H. Cantrell
Langston University, Langston	G. L. Harrison
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater	Henry G. Bennett

Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee	John W. Raley
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City	C. Q. Smith
Phillips University, Enid	Eugene S. Briggs
University of Oklahoma, Norman	Geo. L. Cross
University of Tulsa, Tulsa	C. I. Pontius

OREGON

Lewis and Clark College, Portland	Morgan S. Odell
Linfield College, McMinnville	Harry L. Dillin
Marylhurst College, Marylhurst	Sister M. Rose Augusta
Pacific University, Forest Grove	Walter C. Giersbach
Reed College, Portland	E. B. MacNaughton
University of Oregon, Eugene	Harry K. Newburn
University of Portland, Portland	Theodore J. Mehling
Willamette University, Salem	G. Herbert Smith

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading	Harry V. Masters
Allegheny College, Meadville	Louis T. Benezet
Beaver College, Jenkintown	Raymon M. Kistler
Bucknell University, Lewisburg	Horace A. Hildreth
Cedar Crest College, Allentown	Dale H. Moore
Chestnut Hill College, Chestnut Hill	Sister Maria Kostka
College Misericordia, Dallas	Sister M. Gonzaga
Dickinson College, Carlisle	William W. Edell
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia	James Creese
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh	Francis P. Smith
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown	A. C. Baugher
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster	Theodore A. Distler
Geneva College, Beaver Falls	Charles M. Lee
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg	Henry W. A. Hanson
Grove City College, Grove City	Weir C. Ketler
Haverford College, Haverford	Gilbert F. White
Immaculata College, Immaculata	Vincent L. Burns
Juniata College, Huntingdon	Calvert N. Ellis
Lafayette College, Easton	Ralph C. Hutchison
La Salle College, Philadelphia	Brother G. Paul
Lebanon Valley College, Annville	Clyde A. Lynch
Lehigh University, Bethlehem	Martin D. Whitaker
Lincoln University, Lincoln University	Horace M. Bond
Marywood College, Scranton	Sister M. Eugenia
Mercyhurst College, Erie	Sister M. Borgia Egan, Dean
Moravian College, Bethlehem	Raymond S. Hauptert
Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem	David E. Weinland
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh	Mother M. Irenaeus
Muhlenberg College, Allentown	Levering Tyson
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh	Paul R. Anderson

Pennsylvania State College, State College	James Milholland, <i>Acting</i>
Rosemont College, Rosemont	Mother Mary Boniface
St. Francis College, Loretto	Adrian Veigle
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia	John J. Long
St. Vincent College, Latrobe	Alfred Koch
Seton Hill College, Greensburg	William G. Ryan
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove	G. Morris Smith
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore	John W. Nason
Temple University, Philadelphia	Robert L. Johnson
Thiel College, Greenville	William F. Zimmerman
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia	Harold E. Stassen
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh	R. H. Fitzgerald
University of Scranton, Scranton	J. Eugene Gallery
Ursinus College, Collegeville	Norman E. McClure
Villa Maria College, Erie	Sister Mary Stella
Villanova College, Villanova	Francis X. N. McGuire
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington	James H. Case, Jr.
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg	Paul R. Stewart
Westminister College, New Wilmington	Will W. Orr
Wilson College, Chambersburg	Paul Swain Havens

PUERTO RICO

Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico, San German	Edward G. Seel
University of Puerto Rico, San Juan	Jaime Benitez

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence	Henry M. Wriston
Pembroke College, Brown University, Providence	Margaret S. Morriss, <i>Dean</i>
Providence College, Providence	Robert J. Slavin
Rhode Island State College, Kingston	Carl R. Woodward

SOUTH CAROLINA

Allen University, Columbia	Samuel R. Higgins
Benedict College, Columbia	J. A. Bacoats
Clafin University, Orangeburg	J. J. Seabrook
Coker College, Hartsville	Donald C. Agnew
College of Charleston, Charleston	George D. Grice
Columbia College, Columbia	Oscar W. Lever, <i>Dean</i>
Converse College, Spartanburg	Edward M. Gwathmey
Erskine College, Due West	Robert C. Grier
Furman University, Greenville	John L. Plyler
Lander College, Greenwood	B. M. Grier
Limestone College, Gaffney	R. C. Granberry
Newberry College, Newberry	James C. Kinard
Presbyterian College, Clinton	Marshall W. Brown
State Agricultural and Mechanical College, Orangeburg	M. F. Whittaker
The Citadel, Charleston	C. P. Summerall

Winthrop College, Rock Hill	Henry R. Sims
Wofford College, Spartanburg	Walter K. Greene

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls	Lawrence M. Stavig
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell	Sam Hilburn
Huron College, Huron	George F. McDougall
Yankton College, Yankton	J. Clark Graham

TENNESSEE

Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City	D. Harley Fite
Cumberland University, Lebanon	Edwin S. Preston
Fisk University, Nashville	Charles S. Johnson
King College, Bristol	R. T. L. Liston
Knoxville College, Knoxville	J. Reed Miller
Lane College, Jackson	J. H. White
LeMoyne College, Memphis	Hollis F. Price
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate	Robert L. Kincaid
Maryville College, Maryville	Ralph W. Lloyd
Milligan College, Milligan College	D. E. Walker
Scarritt College, Nashville	Hugh C. Stuntz
Southwestern, Memphis	Peyton N. Rhodes
Tusculum College, Greeneville	George K. Davies
Union University, Jackson	Walter F. Jones
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga	David A. Lockmiller
University of the South, Sewanee	Boylston Green
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	C. E. Brehm
Vanderbilt University, Nashville	Harvie Branscomb

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College, Abilene	Don H. Morris
Austin College, Sherman	W. B. Guerrant
Baylor University, Waco	W. R. White
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene	R. N. Richardson
Howard Payne College, Brownwood	Thomas H. Taylor
Incarinate Word College, San Antonio	Sister M. Columkille
Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Belton	Gordon G. Singleton
McMurry College, Abilene	Harold G. Cooke
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio	John LaSalle McMahon
Rice Institute, Houston	William V. Houston
St. Edward's University, Austin	Edmund Hunt
St. Mary's University of San Antonio	Louis J. Blume
Southern Methodist University, Dallas	Umpfrey Lee
Southwestern University, Georgetown	W. C. Finch, Acting
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth	M. E. Sadler
Texas College, Tyler	D. R. Glass
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville	Ernest H. Poteet

Texas State College for Women, Denton	L. H. Hubbard
Texas State University for Negroes, Houston	R. O. Lanier
Texas Technological College, Lubbock	D. M. Wiggins
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth	Law Sone
Texas Western College, El Paso	Wilson H. Elkins
Trinity University, San Antonio	Monroe G. Everett
University of Texas, Austin	T. S. Painter
Wiley College, Marshall	J. S. Scott

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo	Christen Jensen, <i>Acting</i>
University of Utah, Salt Lake City	Albert R. Olpin
Utah State Agricultural College, Logan	F. S. Harris
Westminster College, Salt Lake City	Robert D. Steele

VERMONT

Bennington College, Bennington	Frederick Burckhardt
Middlebury College, Middlebury	Samuel S. Stratton
Norwich University, Northfield	Robert D. Guinn <i>Acting</i>
St. Michael's College, Winooski	Daniel P. Lyons
University of Vermont, Burlington	William S. Carlson

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College, Bridgewater	Warren D. Bowman
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg	John E. Pomfret
Emory and Henry College, Emory	Foye G. Gibson
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney	Edgar Graham Gammon
Hampton Institute, Hampton	Alonzo G. Moron
Hollins College, Hollins	Bessie C. Randolph
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg	Orville W. Lake
Madison College, Harrisonburg	G. Tyler Miller
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton	Frank B. Lewis
Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg	M. L. Combs
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland	J. Earl Moreland
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg	Theodore H. Jack
Roanoke College, Salem	H. Sherman Oberly
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar	Martha B. Lucas
University of Richmond, Richmond	George M. Modlin
University of Virginia, Charlottesville	Colgate W. Darden, Jr.
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington	Richard J. Marshall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg	Walter S. Newman
Virginia State College, Petersburg	Robert P. Daniel
Virginia Union University, Richmond	J. Malcus Ellison
Washington and Lee University, Lexington	Francis P. Gaines

WASHINGTON

College of Puget Sound, Tacoma	Robert Franklin Thompson
--------------------------------------	--------------------------

Gonzaga University, Spokane	Francis E. Corkery
Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland	S. C. Eastvold
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle	C. Hoyt Watson
Seattle University, Seattle	Albert A. Lemieux
University of Washington, Seattle	Raymond B. Allen
Whitman College, Walla Walla	Chester C. Maxey
Whitworth College, Spokane	Frank F. Warren

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany	W. H. Cramblet
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins	Raymond B. Purdum
Fairmont State College, Fairmont	George H. Hand
Marshall College, Huntington	Stewart H. Smith
Salem College, Salem	S. O. Bond
West Virginia State College, Institute	John W. Davis
West Virginia University, Morgantown	Irvin Stewart
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon	William J. Scarborough

WISCONSIN

Beloit College, Beloit	Carey Croneis
Carroll College, Waukesha	Nelson V. Russell
Lawrence College, Appleton	Nathan M. Pusey
Marquette University, Milwaukee	Edward J. O'Donnell
Milton College, Milton	Carroll L. Hill
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee	Lucia R. Briggs
Mount Mary College, Milwaukee	Edward A. Fitzpatrick
Northland College, Ashland	L. H. Brumbaugh
Ripon College, Ripon	Clark G. Kuebler
St. Norbert College, West De Pere	B. H. Pennings
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Mark H. Ingraham, Dean

WYOMING

University of Wyoming, Laramie	G. D. Humphrey
--------------------------------------	----------------

CANADA

Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia	Watson Kirkconnell
Mount Allison University, Sackville, New Brunswick	W. T. Ross Flemington
University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario	G. Edward Hall
Victoria University, Toronto, Ontario	Walter T. Brown

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

CHINA

Cheeloo University, Tsinan	Wu K'E-Ming
Fukien Christian University, Foochow	Chan-Tung Kang
Ginling College, Nanking	Wu Yi-Fang

Hangchow Christian College, Hangchow	Baen E. Lee
Hua Chung University, Wuchang	Francis C. M. Wei
Hwa Nan College, Foochow	Lucy C. Wang
Lingnan University, Canton	Y. L. Lee
University of Nanking, Nanking	Y. G. Chen
St. John's University, Jessfield Rd., Shanghai	Y. C. Tu
University of Shanghai, 85 Kiukiang Rd., Shanghai	Henry H. Lin
Soochow University, Quinsan Rd., Shanghai	Y. C. Yang
West China Union University, Chengtu	Fong Su-Hsuan
Yenching University, Peiping	William H. Adolph

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Universidad de Santo Domingo, Ciudad Trujillo R. B. Burgos, *Secretary*

LEBANON

American University of Beirut Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr.

TURKEY

American College for Girls, Istanbul Floyd H. Black
Robert College, Istanbul Floyd H. Black

HONORARY MEMBERS

American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Association of University Professors
American Association of University Women
American Council of Learned Societies
American Council on Education
Carnegie Corporation
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
General Education Board
Institute of International Education
Jesuit Educational Association
National Catholic Educational Association
National Protestant Council on Higher Education
Social Science Research Council
Southern Education Foundation
United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa
United States Office of Education

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, INCORPORATED

ARTICLE I

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

ARTICLE II

The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges, Incorporated."

ARTICLE III

MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. The membership of the Association shall be composed of those colleges of liberal arts and sciences which may be duly elected to membership in the Association after recommendation by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. Honorary Membership. The general secretaries of church boards of education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

ARTICLE IV

REPRESENTATION

Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the faculty or board of trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of church boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized

as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

ARTICLE V

FIELD OF OPERATION

SECTION 1. The territory in which the operations of the Association are principally to be conducted is the United States.

ARTICLE VI

OFFICERS

Section 1. The Association shall elect from its membership the following:

1. President
2. Vice President
3. Executive Director
4. Treasurer

SECTION 2. The Executive Director shall be the executive officer of the Association and shall serve until his successor is duly elected. The other officers shall serve for one year or until their successors are duly elected. Election of officers shall be by ballot.

SECTION 3. The duties of the respective officers shall be those usually connected with said offices.

ARTICLE VII

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. The Board of Directors shall consist of eight members, four of whom shall be elected by ballot by the Association, and the other four shall consist of the officers of the Association.

SECTION 2. The President of the Association shall be *ex officio* chairman of the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. Except as provided by statute and as directed by the members of the Association, and subject to the Constitution and By-Laws, the Board of Directors shall have power to manage, operate and direct the affairs of the Association and fill all vacancies.

ARTICLE VIII

QUORUM

Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE IX

BY-LAWS

The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government, not inconsistent with the provisions hereof and the certificate of incorporation.

ARTICLE X

AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two thirds of the members then present.

BY-LAWS

1. Applications for membership shall be made to the Board of Directors, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

2. The annual dues shall be seventy-five dollars (\$75.00) per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

3. At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of January of each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors, provided that four-weeks' notice in writing be given each institution connected with the Association.

4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Board of Directors.

5. All expenditure of funds of the Association shall be authorized by resolution of the Association, or subject to later approval by the Association, by the Board of Directors.

6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at

the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

7. There shall be within the Association a permanent commission to be known as the "Commission on Christian Higher Education." This Commission shall have such autonomy as may be necessary in order to represent the interests of church-related colleges in general and to carry on a program of promoting spiritual values in higher education. The Commission is to operate under rules mutually agreed to by the Commission and the Board of Directors.

8. The Executive Director shall mail three copies of the official BULLETIN to all institutions which are members of the Association. Additional copies, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be had at a special rate.

9. These By-Laws may be amended at any business session of the Association by two thirds vote, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been presented at a previous session.

POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness.*

FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King,* Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
- President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain,* Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond,* Union College
- President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland,* Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger,* University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snively, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University
- 1931-32 President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College
- 1932-33 President Irving Maurer,* Beloit College
- 1933-34 President Edmund D. Soper, Ohio Wesleyan University
- 1934-35 President William Mather Lewis,* Lafayette College
- 1935-36 President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College
- 1936-37 President James R. McCain, Agnes Scott College
- 1937-38 President James L. McConaughy,* Wesleyan University
- 1938-39 President John L. Seaton, Albion College
- 1939-40 President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College
- 1940-41 President Edward V. Stanford, Villanova College
- 1941-42 President Remsen D. Bird, Occidental College
- 1942-43 President Charles E. Diehl, Southwestern
- 1943-44 Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University
- 1944-45 President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University
- 1945-46 President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College
- 1946-47 President Charles J. Turek, Macalester College
- 1947-48 President Mildred McAfee Horton, Wellesley College
- 1948-49 President Kenneth I. Brown, Denison University
- 1949-50 President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas

* Deceased.

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES WILL HOLD ITS NEXT ANNUAL MEETING JANUARY 8-10, 1951 AT THE HOTEL CLARIDGE, ATLANTIC CITY.

THROUGH A GRANT from the Carnegie Corporation we have been able to send the president of each member institution a complimentary copy of **FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION** by Associate Dean Lloyd S. Woodburne of the University of Michigan.

THE COUNCIL OF GUIDANCE AND PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION wishes to announce that it will sponsor a Placement Service at the 1950 Convention at Atlantic City on March 27 through the 30th. This is the organization to which most all persons in the personnel and guidance field belong. If you are thinking of hiring someone in these fields, this is an excellent opportunity for you to have contact with those who are most active. Send inquiries to Miss Dorothy H. Carrington, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago 3, Illinois.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, while striving to broaden the base of philanthropic support, must at the same time seek new or undeveloped sources of financial aid if they are to succeed to any degree in bridging the gap between their capital needs and receipts. This thought is developed in a report on philanthropic trends published today by the John Price Jones Company, Inc., fund-raising and public relations consultants of New York City. One of the underdeveloped sources is corporation giving, according to the report, which declares that institutions of higher learning "must take steps to help corporations justify a larger share of participation in the financing of higher educational needs." As an example of the paucity of corporation giving the report cites that, in 1947, the giving record of 71 largest American manufacturing companies showed "only a little over \$1,000,000 allocated to colleges and universities—6.6 per cent of the total" contributed by these companies to all philanthropic

causes. An all-time record of more than \$11,100,000 was made last year by 396,589 alumni in giving to alumni funds of 173 institutions. While "much more intensive effort" can be expected, the report declares that no matter how much such effort may yield, "we may also be fairly sure that it will not be sufficient to close the gap between need and actuality." Some 12 billion dollars, the report estimates, must be invested in the plant and equipment of American higher education as a whole by 1960 when, it is believed, two billion dollars annually "will be required for operation and instructional needs." While a great deal of this is for state-supported institutions, the figures serve "to show the scope of the problem," the report asserts. Indicating present trends in the source of gifts to private higher educational institutions, the report lists the origin of 437 large benefactions to such institutions in 1948-49. Totaling \$146,668,423 these gifts came as follows:

Bequests	118—	\$65,956,041
Foundation grants	124—	47,189,626
Gifts by living persons	94—	28,885,858
Government grants	69—	2,946,398
Corporation gifts	32—	1,690,500
	<hr/> 437	<hr/> \$146,668,423

In 1920, philanthropic support of private higher education amounted to 43 per cent of the total. In 1947, it was 18.5 per cent, according to the report. "College or university campaigns for capital funds," concludes the report, "can no longer be brief. The tendency everywhere is to conduct more or less continuous fund-raising campaigns."

HEREDITY EAST AND WEST by Julian Huxley is an explanation of the conflict between Mendelian and Lysenkoist genetics. The scientific, social and political aspects of the controversy from its earliest days to its culmination in the official banning of Mendelism in the U.S.S.R. are explored with great clarity. As Director General of UNESCO, with science an international activity, Dr. Huxley had the opportunity of conversing with Lysenko and hearing him lecture in 1945. Since then, a thorough study of this theory adopted by the Soviet Union has

convinced the author that there are no scientific grounds for Lysenko's belief. Henry Schuman, Inc., Publishers, New York.

GOETHE AS A SCIENTIST by Rudolph Magnus, translated by Heinz Norden, calls attention to the relationship between the creative artist and the scientist. Science was ever-present in his literary works; his scientific treatises were suffused with creative imagination. We see Goethe as the founder of comparative anatomy, as an outstanding botanist, as an untiring pursuer of the secrets of color and light. Written more than a generation ago, this lucid study is now for the first time presented in English. Henry Schuman, Inc., Publishers, New York.

SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS AND LOANS by S. Norman Feingold is a valuable directory and reference book giving information on nearly twenty million dollars' worth of educational aids and listing nearly three hundred administering agencies which offer several thousand scholarships, fellowships and loans each year. This is especially useful to students who have no way of discovering what scholarships and educational aids are available. Bellman Publishing Company, Inc., Boston.

PI LAMBDA THETA, National Association for Women in Education, announces two awards of \$400 each to be granted on or before August 15, 1950. An unpublished study may be submitted on any aspect of the professional problems of women, either in education or some other field. All inquiries should be addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Studies and Awards, Education Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

A HEALTH PROGRAM FOR COLLEGES, a report of the Third National Conference on Health in Colleges sponsored by 37 national education and health organizations, discusses the major health problems of college students and gives constructive suggestions for setting up an active health program in a college. This retails for two dollars and can be obtained from the Third National Conference on Health in Colleges, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N. Y.

ALBERT EINSTEIN: PHILOSOPHER-SCIENTIST edited by Paul Arthur Schilpp is Volume VII in The Library of Living Philosophers. The Library of Living Philosophers, Inc., Evanston, Illinois.

AN INTRODUCTION TO COLLEGE by Samuel Engle Burr, Jr., is a summary of a course being given by the author at American University (Washington, D. C.) to students entering college. Burgess Publishing Company, Minneapolis.

EDUCATION IN ARAB COUNTRIES OF THE NEAR EAST by Roderic D. Matthews and Matta Akrawi is a comprehensive and thorough descriptive report of the educational systems of the Arab World covering Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan and Palestine. American Council on Education, Washington 6, D. C.

PREDICTING SUCCESS IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS is a report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Student Personnel Work published by the American Council on Education, Washington 6, D. C.

THE PEOPLE'S COLLEGES by Ruby Green Smith is a history of the New York State Extension Service in Cornell University and the State from 1876 to 1948. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

THE HIGH SCHOOL FOR TODAY by Harold Spears, Assistant Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, tells of the problems of the secondary school and traces the history of secondary education from its earliest beginnings in New England down to the present time. American Book Company, New York 16, New York.

THERE IS AN OLD STORY of a Harvard freshman who in answering a history question wrote that "Dante stood with one foot in the Middle Ages and with the other he saluted the rising star of the Renaissance." Our generation finds itself like the freshman's Dante, with one foot in a passing age, but saluting with the other a new era of great uncertainty.

But we are clear that a new world has appeared. As the British Ambassador, Sir Oliver Franks, recently told our students in Claremont, the discovery of nuclear fission resembles "the moment when Galileo looked through his telescope and destroyed forever a picture of the universe which men had cherished for centuries." At the end of a victorious war we saw the military means with which it had been waged made obsolescent by the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Standing between a war not yet ended and a peace not yet made, we have been gripped by uncertainty and, in the phrase of Professor Robert E. Fitch, of the Pacific School of Religion, have fallen down before the bomb in "pagan terror." As man, through science, acquired greater mastery of nature, he has paradoxically lost faith in his power to control his own destiny. This doubt of human reason and power in the mid-twentieth century is in marked contrast to the confident spirit of both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Such lack of confidence does no credit to our generation. Nor is it in conformity with a rational interpretation of the facts of contemporary society. The middle of the twentieth century is one of those decisive periods that come only occasionally in human history. "We are not caught in a pattern of decline and fall, a doom from which no civilization can escape," as Toynbee writes so eloquently . . . "We are endowed with freedom of choice and our future depends largely upon ourselves."

It is obvious that the United States will be the most significant force in shaping the truly world history into which all existing civilizations have now been swept. Unlike many nations, once world leaders, we are not forced to be passive, but can choose what influence we as a people wish to exert.

The example of American technical achievement and the evidences of our generosity to a stricken world have struck the imagination of men and women around the globe. But we must agree with Walter Lippman that "the burden on the United States is increasing, not so much in the material sense as in the intellectual and spiritual." Our leadership can enrich the world only if we place our faith in those things which "neither moth nor rust doth corrupt."

These truths are perceived by educated men and women.

Through our colleges and universities individuals must be taught the part they can play in shaping a better future. A new Renaissance can be ours if we have the courage and intelligence to work for it and to believe in its possibility. Education can also give us fortitude for living with problems we cannot resolve.

The liberal arts colleges have been basic in the development of higher education in the United States. Established by Christian churches, they have been centers of religious and ethical teaching. The liberal arts colleges have remained among the freest institutions of American society because they are not restrained by state or government controls. As Paul G. Hoffman, head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, said recently after addressing our students at Claremont: "Looking into the faces of those young people, I could not help thinking how much we in America owe to the liberal arts colleges. No matter how dark the moment, they have kept alive the spark of free inquiry. They have persistently maintained the right and duty of teachers and students to seek the truth."

NOTE: The above is an excerpt from 1949 Annual Report of President E. Wilson Lyon, Pomona College.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND PATENT PROBLEMS is a composite report on the five regional conferences on university research and patent problems, which the National Research Council's Patent Policy Survey held in Denver, Berkeley, Chicago, New York and Atlanta last spring. The report contains summary digests of the proceedings of each of the conferences and a composite resumé of the research and patent problems discussed. It is organized in chapters dealing with these problems under the following topical groupings: need for a university patent policy, unorganized research, organized research, sponsored research, patent management and principles and considerations involved in formulating research and patent policies. The paper on "Research, Inventions and Patents" delivered by Captain George N. Robillard, USN, Assistant Chief of Naval Research (for Patents), at the Denver conference is also included. The report, written by Archie M. Palmer, may be obtained from the Patent Policy Survey, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D. C.

AMONG THE COLLEGES

AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE has just closed a subscription campaign which raised \$1,500,000 for endowment and new buildings. This was begun because of an anonymous gift of \$500,000 which specified that the college secure as much or more from other donors.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE has received a gift of \$225,000 in settlement of a trust fund established by the late Edwin B. Smith, a graduate of Bowdoin in the class of 1856.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY received \$4,039,619 in gifts, grants and bequests during the fiscal year 1948-49.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE has received \$1,500 from Sou Chan, New York restaurateur, to start a Chan Scholarship Fund for deserving young men of Chinese extraction.

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY has been left \$300,000 by Mrs. Lucy Rowland Rector for the Rector Scholarship Foundation Fund, which was founded in 1920 by her late husband, Mr. Edward Rector. During their lifetime the family gave approximately \$4,000,000 to DePauw.

HAMLIN UNIVERSITY has been bequeathed \$515,000 by the late Charles M. Drew, former Minneapolis attorney, to be used for additional classroom or laboratory facilities.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY has received \$300,000 from Curt H. Reisinger, New York financier, to establish the Samuel Hazzard Cross Professorship of Slavic Languages and Literatures. Professor Cross was Chairman of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Harvard before his death in 1946. The university has also received \$50,000 presented by a corporation to the Harvard Foundation for Advanced Study and Research.

HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION received a gift of \$50,000 from the Grant Foundation, Inc. The money will be used to provide scholarship and fellowship aid for college graduates taking the Business School course for the degree of Master of Business Administration and for businessmen attending the special courses of the Advanced Management Training Program.

HOFSTRA COLLEGE announces the gift of a new building to serve business and banking education at the college and to provide quarters for the American Institute of Banking educational program. The donor, Emil R. Heger, is president of the Bank of Malverne. Heger Hall will contain classrooms and offices for programs in banking, business administration, management and allied subjects and will be erected and furnished at the cost of approximately a quarter of a million dollars.

LA VERNE COLLEGE has recently been given \$13,772.84 from the estate of Guy E. Whitney of Laton, California. The funds will be placed in a rotary loan fund for scholarships and loans to students planning to enter the fulltime ministry, Christian teaching or missionary work.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE is announcing the third session of Mount Holyoke Institute on the United Nations to be held in South Hadley from June 25-July 22, 1950. The institute will again provide men and women concerned with world affairs an opportunity for study and discussion with officials of the United Nations, United States and foreign governments and specialists in international affairs. All inquiries should be addressed to Marjorie Fisher, Executive Secretary, Mount Holyoke Institute on the United Nations, South Hadley, Massachusetts.

NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY received a gift of \$1,000,000 from Mrs. Fred J. Fisher, widow of one of the founders of the Fisher Body Company, Detroit, Michigan. Of the gift \$750,000 is to be used for construction of a new dormitory and the remaining \$250,000 to be placed in trust and used for loans to students working their way through college.

POMONA COLLEGE received gifts totaling \$193,738.04 during the past year.

POMONA COLLEGE has established an Institute of Public Affairs dedicated to the American ideal that progress in all areas of human activity, whether economic, social, technical or cultural, is most rapid in a free society of free men. In establishing the Institute, Pomona College hopes to contribute significantly to informed and responsible discussion of basic questions of public policy. Through the Institute, the college will endeavor to bring business, labor, professional and community leaders together for common exchange of facts and views relating to major issues both internal and international.

ROLLINS COLLEGE will receive two-ninths of the residuary estate of the late Rex Beach, the well-known writer.

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY announces the completion of a Fine Arts Building and auditorium costing one million five hundred thousand dollars and containing two hundred thousand dollars' worth of equipment.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY has established a series of research fellowships in Naval History for the study of sea-power in relation to air-power and land-power. These are to be called the James Forrestal Fellowships in Naval History and further information can be obtained from the Superintendent of the Naval Academy.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH announces the receipt of two grants totaling \$35,000 from the Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation,—\$10,000 is for research in the Addison H. Gibson Medical Laboratory and \$25,000 for a study of nursing service.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY received gifts amounting to \$2,016,000 during its Bicentennial Season.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE has successfully completed its building and endowment fund drive for \$2,500,000. The campaign was launched in the spring of 1947. More than 4,000 donors

contributed, with three individual gifts of \$100,000 heading the list. The income of the first \$1,000,000 paid in has already been applied to increasing faculty salaries.

WOFFORD COLLEGE has received a gift of \$80,000 from .

Isaac Andrews, textile manufacturer of Spartanburg, to provide the following additions to the Field House: a tile swimming pool, classroom, offices, showers and lockers, and a trophy room.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

- Anatolia College, Thessalonika, Greece. Carl C. Compton.
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas. Fred A. Walker.
Duchesne College of the Sacred Heart, Omaha, Nebraska. Mother Mary Downey.
Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs, North Carolina. Marshall S. Woodson, Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Thomasville, Georgia.
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa. J. Raymond Chadwick.
Loyola University, Los Angeles, California. Charles S. Casassa.
McKendree College, Lebanon, Illinois. Russell Grow.
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, California. Mother Agnes Marie O'Laughlin.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania. Milton S. Eisenhower, President, Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science.
Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Evan A. Reiff, Professor of English, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.
St. Peter's College, Jersey City, New Jersey. James J. Shanahan.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army.
University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont. William S. Carlson, President, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.
William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa. Charles S. Ball, College Pastor, Friends University, Wichita, Kansas.
Yale University, New London, Connecticut. Alfred Whitney Griswold, Professor of History.